

14th March 1923]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, I have given specific dates from which these experiments were discontinued. I request the hon. Member to make enquiries and ascertain the reasons for the discontinuance of these experiments. We want the figures for settlement purposes. I personally ascertained from the office of the Director of Agriculture that these experiments had been discontinued."

• The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" These experiments are no longer conducted by officers of the Land Revenue Department; they are being attended to by officers of the Agricultural Department."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I know that the experiments have been discontinued by the Land Revenue Department staff and that they have been ordered to be conducted by the Agricultural Department staff. It is because the Agricultural Department also have discontinued, I want the reasons for the discontinuance."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" That information is not within my knowledge, Sir."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I give the hon. the Revenue Member a statement of fact; will he not be pleased to make enquiries at least now?"

*Representation of Provincial-aided Teacher-managers' Association in the District Educational Councils.*

883-Q.—Khan Sahib A. P. I. SAIYID IBRAHIM RAVUTTAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state the names of the districts in the Madras Presidency wherein the Provincial-aided Teacher-managers' Association has not been represented in the District Educational Councils?

A.—All districts except Madras.

II

COMMUNICATION TO THE COUNCIL.

The SECRETARY laid on the table the Press Communique,\* dated the 5th February 1923, issued with reference to the resolution passed by the Council at the meeting of the 14th September 1922 to increase the number of Government audit certificate-holders.

III

MOTIONS ON THE BUDGET FOR 1923-24.

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—" Mr. President, may I just bring to your notice the fact that copies of motions on the budget were furnished to us only a few minutes ago, just before the Council assembled? I wish to know whether we are not entitled to some notice with reference to these reductions of budget grants."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" We are going to take up now Demand V—Registration, and surely motions on this demand were circulated to the hon. Members on Monday last."

\* Vide Appendix on page 2364 infra.

[14th March 1923]

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—" I am referring to the motions on Demand VIII—General Administration, which I suppose will be taken up for discussion very soon."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" It is very unlikely that Demand VIII—General Administration will be reached to-day ; at any rate, I can assure the hon. Member that it will not be reached in the forenoon of to-day."

#### DEMAND V—REGISTRATION.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, I beg to move—

*That the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 23.52 lakhs under Demand V—Registration."*

#### MOTION No. 59.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, I beg to move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 23.52 lakhs for Registration by Rs. 100.*

My object in making this motion is to invite the attention of the hon. the Minister to certain aspects of the administration of this department. I know, Sir, he is taking considerable interest to re-organize and place the department on a very satisfactory footing. In this task he is assisted by a very zealous Inspector-General of Registration who co-operates with the hon. the Minister most loyally. All the same, I should like to know whether the money they are saving out of the administration of this department should not go to the relief of the people concerned. I think it is in the interests of the Government as well as the people that registration should be as easy as possible for the ryots to have recourse to. It was only last year we increased the registration fees considerably. I would like to know whether it is not the intention of the Government to revise their policy of enhancing and restore the registration fees to the figures they originally stood at.

" I think there is also considerable room for further retrenchment in this department. Formerly, we used to have one District Registrar attending to the work of two or more districts. I wish to know whether that old system cannot be resorted to advantageously. Frankly, I feel that there is no necessity for the appointment of one District Registrar for each district and the work that they are now called upon to do in each district is not worth the money spent on them."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I thank the hon. Member for stating that we are doing the work in the Registration Department most efficiently. But I shall not be vain enough to claim all the credit to myself, for the re-organization of this department was taken up by the hon. Sir P. Rajagopala Achariyar when he was in charge of it. He began the re-organization and I am continuing the policy which he has inaugurated.

" My hon. friend said that separate District Registrars are not necessary for each and every district ; but I think that one District Registrar is absolutely necessary for each district in the interests of the people. From practical experience we find that it is quite essential that each district should have its own District Registrar. My hon. friend has also raised another question, namely, that the profits of this department should be devoted entirely for the expansion of this department or for the relief of the people by way of reduction of rates. As regards this, I can only say that it is a very large question.

14th March 1923]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

Financially, we cannot say that the surplus revenue in any department should be utilized for the development of that particular department. The surplus revenues from all the departments should go to the common fund. Where a department yields much revenue, no doubt, it is necessary that a certain proportion of the revenue should be devoted, not actually ear-marked, for the development of that particular department. All these questions are under consideration and as soon as our financial condition improves, the whole question will be re-considered."

MR. M. RATNASWAMI :—" Sir, as I have put down another motion for reduction, I am very thankful to you, Sir, for allowing me to speak on this motion. I am not a financial expert, but it seems to me that the expenditure on the Registration Department is out of all proportion to the revenue derived therefrom. In 1921-22 the proportion was as much as 66 per cent, in 1922-23 it was 60 per cent and in the ensuing year 1923-24 it is 62 per cent. Sir, when in other countries the Registration Department is run most economically, I would ask why an effort should not be made in this province to run the department though not as economically as in other countries at least much more economically than it has hitherto been done. If the hon. the Minister in charge of this department finds it absolutely impossible to work this department except with the amount of expenditure that he has budgeted for, I think he should devise ways and means for increasing the revenue of this department. To a layman like myself it seems that if we are to spend such a large amount only to derive the little revenue, that we are getting now, we might as well drop this source of revenue altogether. The hon. the Minister might defend the position of this department by saying that it is merely intended to defend the rights of property of the people in this country. Are not, in other countries, the rights of the property defended as well and even much better than they are secured here, and still they are able in those countries to run the Registration Department much more economically than it is done here? As I have already pointed out in my speech during the general discussion of the Budget, I think we have to attack questions of policy rather than tinker the expenditure here and there, and I think that until a more radical spirit is introduced in the administration, the finances will continue in their present condition."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, my hon. friend, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, has advised us that we should cut down the rates of registration fees in order that the people may be relieved of a portion of their burden. Now, my hon. friend, Mr. Ratnaswami, suggests that we should increase the rates of registration fees so that the department may get some more revenue."

MR. M. RATNASWAMI :—" Sir, I did not suggest any increase in the present rates of registration fees. All that I stated was that ways and means should be devised for increasing the revenues of this department."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, one of the ways in which the revenues of the department can be increased is by enhancing the present rates of registration fees."

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Another way of increasing the revenues is by reducing the expenditure incurred on the administration of the department."

[14th March 1923]

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"The expenditure has been reduced to the barest possible minimum in this department. We have got applications from different parts of the Presidency asking for the opening of more Registration offices and in order to meet the incessant demands of the people we have introduced the itinerary registration system. If we are satisfied that there is a proper demand for registration in a particular locality, we shall make these offices permanent. Having done all that we can in the matter of reduction of expenditure, I am unable to say at present how we can do anything more than that."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 23.52 lakhs for Registration was put and carried.

The grant was made.

#### DEMAND VI—IRRIGATION—CIVIL OFFICERS.

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB  
11-16 a.m. Bahadur :—"Sir, I move for a grant of Rs. 8.21 lakhs under Demand VI—Irrigation—Civil Officers."

Mr. V. C. VELLINGIRI GOUNDAR :—"Sir, I have tabled the following motion :—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 23,760 for eleven supervisors.*

My object was to cut down the establishment charges under Minor Irrigation. Considering the amount spent in other departments in the matter of establishment charges and the work turned out by them, the House will find that the work that is being done by this department is very little compared with the amount spent on its establishment. So, the Public Works Department may as well be asked to undertake this work also by dispensing with the services of this establishment. By cutting down this establishment we shall be saving some money which may be utilized for this purpose. Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar has tabled another motion of this kind and he will be able to deal with this matter better. I therefore propose to withdraw the motion."

#### MOTION No. 60.

MUSTAPHA RAVUTTAR AHMAD MIRAN SAHIB :—"Sir, the motion standing in my name is this :—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 23,760 for eleven supervisors.*

In moving this I should like to indicate a few points for the consideration of the House.

"When retrenchment has become the burning topic of the day, and when officials in all the districts of this Presidency are trying their level best to find out ways and means to reduce the enormous expenditure, I am glad to have this opportunity of making this motion. I have to ask of you earnestly to lend me your patient ears when I give you some of the facts and figures. Out of the 21 districts of this Presidency only 11 of them can boast of possessing minor irrigation supervisors. The fertile districts of Gōdāvari, Kistna, Nellore, Tanjore and Trichinopoly do not seem to suffer in the least from the want of a supervisor : but the less fertile and larger allotment-possessing districts must needs be burdened with one of these superfluous supermen.

14th March 1923] [Mustapha Ravuttar Ahmad Miran Sahib]

That this is an ironical situation, and that the services of the supervisors are superfluous can only be judged if we carefully examine the work they do. The sub-overseers have to submit the estimates to the Collector; these are checked by the supervisor with the assistance of a clerk-draughtsman and then sanctioned by the Collector. The Collector, it seems, has no power to sanction estimates above Rs. 1,000. These are sent to the Superintending Engineer for his scrutiny, and only after his approval are the estimates sanctioned. The minor irrigation overseer thus plays very little part in these matters. The same applies to uninvestigated works.

"Many of the tanks of the Revenue Department are rainfed, and the chances of complicated repairs are practically nil. Even if there be any, there are very many overseers, subordinates of the Engineering College, possessing the same qualification as the highly-paid supervisors, to whose charge the whole responsibility might be relegated. But there is very little chance even for the overseer to show his technical skill and learning since most of the repairs in these tanks are earthwork, repairs to the sluice and surplus work. According to the Board's Standing Order the tahsildar is the check-measuring officer, and it is his duty to look after the work of the overseer. That the minor irrigation supervisor plays an insignificant part even as an out-door officer is evidently proved by the Timnevelly Collector's communication which runs thus :

The minor irrigation supervisor is not the check-measuring officer. His inspection is intended only to help the check-measuring officers as a safeguard against any fraud and to ensure efficient execution. If the tahsildars who are responsible to be proceeded against for any loss think that in any case there will be risk that they will be defrauded and work done inefficiently, they may apply in such cases alone for inspection by the professional expert. It is not therefore essential that the supervisor should check all works costing over Rs. 1,000 before final payment. This will also avoid any delay in payment on the score of his inspection. . . .

When we glance through the minor irrigation establishment for the whole of this Presidency, we find minor irrigation supervisors are appointed to those districts which have higher allotments than others. That this is not a good criterion, any intelligent man can say with but a moment's thought. Firstly, because the Board's Standing Order has given powers to the tahsildar to be a check-measuring officer; secondly, the nature of the repairs to these tanks does not require any technical expert; thirdly, the supervisor is not in any way better qualified than the subordinates; fourthly, even if he be one with better qualifications, his powers are very limited.

"The ten districts which manage without the help of a supervisor are helped by the Public Works Department. We have one Engineer assisted by four subdivisional officers in every district. Cannot the help of these officers be obtained in times of emergency as is done in these ten districts? In all districts minor irrigation works costing over Rs. 2,500 styled as 'minor irrigation large works' are finally billed for only when a Public Works Department subdivisional officer approves that the work has been executed satisfactorily. The minor irrigation supervisor's voice is of no value. Regarding works costing less than Rs. 2,500 the tahsildar or the revenue divisional officer checks the work; here again the high-pay-no-work supervisor is very rarely called for assistance.

"Under these circumstances, it is my humble opinion that the services of the supervisors are quite superfluous and unnecessary. The clerk-draughtsman can be retained just to check the estimates; but it is high time, I think, to dispense with the services of the supervisors who may be entertained in

[Mustapha Ravuttar Ahmad Miran Sahib] [14th March 1923]

the Public Works Department. By doing so each district will save at least Rs. 2,600 per annum. I leave the motion to be discussed by the House and to be accepted if hon. Members think that it can with reason be accepted."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Sir, this question regarding the necessity or otherwise for the continuance of the office of supervisor in the Minor Irrigation Department came under discussion during the last Budget debate, and I then undertook to investigate into the matter and see whether that class of officials was any longer necessary. The question was very carefully considered and I may inform the House that we have come to the conclusion that this class of supervisors is no longer a necessity. We have at present eleven supervisors with varying services in the department. Some of them may probably retire in the near future; but all of them will not; nor can we force them to do so. We tried our best to offer some of them, whom we could not get rid of immediately, to the Public Works Department, but the latter pleaded that they had more officers than they wanted. It is therefore impossible for them also to absorb either all our supervisors, or a large number of them. We are, therefore, proposing, Sir, to circularize those Collectors under whom supervisors exist to see to it that those who can retire are made to retire immediately and that when vacancies occur, they should not be filled up. Thus, I think, this class of supervisors will become extinct as early as possible."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 61.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, the motion that stands in my name runs as follows :—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 2,28,628 for establishment.*

The hon. the Revenue Member has just now been explaining the position with regard to a portion of the grant which I want to get rid of altogether. Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib has given very good reasons for my motion. He has shown that so far as works which cost over Rs. 1,000 are concerned, the estimates have to be sanctioned by the Public Works Department officers and before payment is made, the works have to be checked and passed again by them. He has also stated, Sir, that there is very little of technical skill required in the execution of these works. Even though he has made a motion only for the omission of the allotment made for 11 supervisors, he has argued for the omission of the allotment for establishment. There is absolutely no necessity to have a separate establishment like this to look after works that are still under the Revenue Department. The total allotment for the works is only Rs. 5,98,000, and the cost of establishment alone, for the omission of which this motion has been tabled, comes to Rs. 2,28,000 and odd. That shows how expensive the establishment is.

"Besides, in every district we have got a Public Works Department establishment which is supposed to look after all the irrigation works, and we have got more Public Works Department officers than minor irrigation officers. That is to say, the minor irrigation officers have to cover a larger area than the Public Works Department officers. So, in order to get something done in a particular jurisdiction, a man paying a large amount of travelling allowance has to come from a long distance and look after it when, as a

14th March 1923] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

matter of fact, we have got a Public Works Department officer to look after it—a man better qualified for it and better entitled to see that it is carried out. So, Sir, both with regard to efficiency—which is a term very often thrown at us by the other side—and with regard to economy, it is absolutely essential that this establishment, costing a sum of 2 lakhs and odd when the whole of the allotment for works is only costing us 5 lakhs and odd, should be abolished.

\* “Then, Sir; it may also be said that these minor irrigation officers are not people of very high status and it is more often than not that they find very great difficulty in finding contractors and getting work done.

“It is not very rare to find them seeking the help of Revenue officers and giving them all sorts of trouble; on the other hand there is the Tahsildar who is made in some cases responsible for the non-execution of the work saying that the minor irrigation officer is responsible and so on. The Tahsildar has very often to go with Minor Irrigation officers and find contractors for the carrying out of works. So these Minor Irrigation officers are more in the way of things being done than really advancing the cause for which they are there. There are officers already who can undertake the work. It cannot be said that the Public Works Department has got other works and that it cannot undertake this additional work. As a matter of fact, the Public Works officers are too many and they have not enough work. We have to keep up the present establishment of the Public Works Department only for fear that if we reduce the number the circles will have to be made larger and not on account of heaviness of work. So this additional work is not going to break the system either in the Public Works Department or Minor Irrigation Department. So, both for the sake of economy and for the sake of avoiding all sorts of trouble it is absolutely necessary that this establishment should go. There is always the obligation on the part of the officers of the Public Works Department to check-measure and this sometimes leads to trouble. To avoid all these things the best course would be to put the major works in the hands of the Public Works Department, and, where the work is very small, to ask the revenue officials to carry it out without any additional establishment. It is with this view that I move this motion.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUMAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—“Sir, it may be well if the House has an idea of what is exactly understood by the term ‘minor irrigation work’. Minor irrigation works are divided into three classes: (1) works which are intended to irrigate 10 acres and less; (2) works which are intended to irrigate 50 acres and less; and (3) works which are intended to irrigate 200 acres and less. All works which are intended to irrigate over 200 acres are under the control of the Public Works Department. I might also at the same breath give to the House an idea of the total number of minor irrigation works in the province. We have at the present moment 28,705 minor irrigation works spread throughout the presidency. Sir, some of these works fall under the first class, which I might term as the ‘tiny tanks’; and they are spread throughout the area of a taluk or a division or a district as the case may be. A large number of them are situated almost in inaccessible tracts of the country. The number of tanks under the control of each sub-overseer in charge of minor irrigation works is between 200 and 250. It is wrong to imagine that the Revenue Department should have no manner of connexion whatsoever with the minor irrigation works. I would say that the Land Revenue

[Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [14th March 1923]

Department has the fullest responsibility for the maintenance and control of minor irrigation works. The ryot who is called upon to pay the tax in respect of the land which receives water from a particular irrigation source looks, and looks only, to the officers of the Land Revenue Department to rectify any defect which he might notice in the work from which he is entitled to get water. He does not recognize the officers of the Public Works Department even in cases where the tanks are in charge of the Public Works Department. He invariably rushes to his Revenue Inspector or the Tahsildar and lays his complaint at his door and it is these officers who in their turn have to serve as the post office for the transmission of these complaints to the officers of the Public Works Department. It takes time before these preliminaries are resorted to, and by the time the officer of the Public Works Department goes there, looks into the matter, prepares his estimate on the schedule rates and sends it up to the Executive Engineer, and he to his Superintending Engineer, and so on, a good lot of time intervenes. But in the case of minor irrigation works which still continue in the charge of the Revenue Department—and rightly so—each sub-overseer has got a certain number of tanks under his control. It is his duty to be patrolling these tanks in order to see what repairs are necessary. It is his duty again to go to the village and consult the village officers and the villagers themselves, draw up an estimate post-haste and send it to the Tahsildar so that the work may be speedily done. If the work cannot be speedily done, and the ryot is called upon to pay tax, he will have every right to ask his revenue officer whether there was any liability on his part to pay his tax when the officers of the Revenue Department would not hold themselves responsible for the repair of those very sources from which he must get the water to irrigate his field and raise his crop. I think it will be a sad day when the Land Revenue Department will divest itself of the responsibility for the maintenance of these minor irrigation works. What happens Sir? These works have necessarily to be carried on during the non-monsoon period. These works numbering 200 to 250, as I have already informed the House, in charge of each sub-overseer, have to be promptly inspected, estimates prepared and executed before the rains set in. On account of the fact that most of these works are small and that a large number of them are situated in inaccessible portions of the country, it is impossible to attract responsible contractors to them. Therefore, the obligation is cast upon the minor irrigation sub-overseer to go to the village, sit *darna* at the door of the village officers and either induce them to take up the work or induce some ryot or other to take it up and somehow see that it is executed. His responsibilities in this direction extend not merely to one work or two works but to 200 to 250 works and he has got to be always up and doing all those months; because you will find that works started in different parts of his jurisdiction require his supervision from time to time. That being the nature of the work to be done, is it expected that the officers of the Public Works Department can undertake it and look after all these tiny little tanks to the number of 28,000 and odd, spread over all parts of the taluk, village and district and be always at those places and carry out the works in time? His responsibility does not end with mere repair. The sub-overseer has to be constantly moving in order to see that the repairs are properly carried out, and that the money is properly spent. Even after the repairs have been made, he has to be patrolling those tanks to see if those repairs are substantial. This is his work all the year round. If all this work is going to be transferred

14th March 1923] [Sir Muḥammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

to the shoulders of the Public Works Department the inevitable consequence will be that they will not be able to do it in time and they will naturally clamour for more staff, and when they clamour for more staff, I can assure the hon. mover that the cost to be incurred will be much more than the cost now incurred. I consulted the Public Works Department whether they could shoulder the responsibility for the whole of this work and the answer has come to me in the negative. In this connexion I may inform the House that when I was touring in the deltas, the complaints to me from the ryots were not that these minor irrigation works were in charge of the Land Revenue Department, but for the transfer of the major works also under their control. That is the demand of the ryot; and I say, Sir, that if this House is going to pass this motion, they will be only doing a thing absolutely against the welfare and the wishes of the ryots."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" Sir, I was quite surprised at the answer of the hon. the Revenue Member. It was not my proposal that these works should be taken away from the Revenue Department and entrusted to the Public Works Department. All that I said was that this separate establishment was unnecessary and that where we had a complicated work which required any technical skill, such work could be carried out with the help of the Public Works Department. That is what I said. The hon. the Revenue Member himself admitted that the number of tanks which a sub-overseer would have to look after was 250. Does he seriously want us to believe that for each one of these 250 tanks, a sub-overseer has to prepare estimates in a year? He said that the hon. the Minister for Public Works has asked for additional establishment and that was one of his reasons for opposing this motion. I find something like a domestic breeze is going on. The Public Works Department does not want additional establishment for carrying out the minor irrigation works. Sir, it cannot be said that these sub-overseers are really in charge of these works. What really takes place is this: The revenue officer is really in charge of these works and he is responsible for the upkeep of these tanks. It is his duty to arrange for their repairs and to see that sufficient supply of water is given to the ryots. The revenue officer, I repeat, is the person who is in charge of these tanks. So, what I suggest is that when the work required to be done is very meagre and requires no technical skill, it might be carried out by the Revenue Department. The hon. the Revenue Member stated just now that these minor irrigation officers had to go and remain in the village and sit *darna* in the house of the village munsif in order to induce him to arrange to do the work. My experience is otherwise. All that these officers do is that they go to the Tahsildar and force him to undertake a journey to that particular village where there is work to be done and ask him to induce somebody to take up the work. That is what is done usually. So really the responsibility that is put on the shoulders of the sub-overseers is practically borne by the revenue officers. This is only an additional wheel to the cart and nothing more. So all that I proposed was that the minor irrigation works should continue under the control of the revenue officers as hitherto, but that any work which requires technical skill and supervision should be executed by Public Works Department through the contractors chosen as at present, by the Revenue Department. It is not proposed to take away all these minor irrigation works from the revenue officers or that nobody should look after all these things and that the people should be put to all sorts of trouble. As a matter of fact I have heard complaints against

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [14th March 1923]

the sub-overseers to the effect that it was on account of them that several works which have been sanctioned have not been carried out within the allotted time.

"Then, Sir, the hon. the Revenue Member also stated that all the works had to be done in the non-monsoon period.

"I do not know whether this is quite correct. In many places the work has to be done throughout the year, or whenever occasion arises. For instance when a breach occurs in a certain place, it has to be attended to at once, not really during non-monsoon season. It is the revenue official who actually does the work and not the overseer or the sub-overseer. The actual amount allotted for repairs and maintenance is Rs. 5,98,700. The cost of establishment alone is Rs. 2,28,000. This I consider is unconscionable. It is on that account that I move this motion."

11-45 a.m.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I am afraid I cannot agree with my hon. friend Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar in the line of argument which he adopted with reference to this motion. I am really surprised at the remedy proposed by Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar, namely, that the whole establishment should be abolished. The remedy that has been suggested by a very representative committee, which is known as the Public Works Department Reorganization Committee, at least with reference to minor irrigation works, is this : that all the small works scattered in the various parts of the Presidency, as pointed out by my hon. friend the Revenue Member, should be transferred to the control of the district boards, so that the people may have a real voice in getting their works pushed through and completed to their satisfaction, just as they are now doing with regard to local fund works. That being the real remedy, to say that the Public Works Department should be in charge of minor irrigation works is a thing which I for one cannot understand. I am quite certain that the Public Works Department is too powerful even in the maintenance and control of the minor irrigation works, and if the Minor Irrigation department is entirely abolished I do not think the wishes of the people will be carried out in time. If my hon. friend's proposal is carried out, it seems to me that the Revenue Officers will not be in a position to carry out these works which they are supposed to supervise. If my hon. friend's object is really to further the improvement of the minor irrigation works, it is certainly not by getting rid of all the establishment which is looking after them, but by getting the controlling and supervising work of this department done in such a manner as to expedite its constructional works. I know that in previous years there was a complaint in this Council that the cost of establishment in the Minor Irrigation Department was far too small and several hon. Members, who took part in the debate, urged that the expenditure should be increased. Therefore the remedy suggested by my hon. friend that the whole of the establishment should be got rid of is certainly not a remedy which ought to be adopted in a case like this. I am certain my hon. friend in his enthusiasm for local self-government wants to transfer the work which is now in the hands of the Revenue Department to the Public Works Department. I think the best course for him would be to propose that all minor irrigation works should be placed under the management of district boards. Under these circumstances I trust my hon. friend will see his way to withdraw his motion."

14th March 1923]

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—  
 “I wish to say only one or two words at this stage. The suggestion of the hon. mover in the course of his reply was that what he really intended was that the work of estimating, execution and supervision should be transferred to the officers of the Public Works Department but that the officers of the Revenue Department should all the same remain responsible for their maintenance. I am hardly able to understand the exact manner in which a proposal like that can be given effect to. When once these works are handed over to the Public Works Department, human nature being what it is, the officers of the Land Revenue Department will be absolutely careless about them, whereas they will be bombarded with requests for repairs and other works from the ryots with whom they have to deal from morning to evening and from whom they have to collect land cess by proving the justification for such collection; and if the ryots are not satisfied in certain cases, the only power that these Revenue Officers will possess is that they can carry the complaint of the ryot to the Subdivisional officer or the Engineer concerned. That would be, I think, a very undesirable state of affairs, so far as small ryots are concerned. Another matter is that the Minor Irrigation Officer has to get work done in the form of *Kudimaramat*. It is a system by which the ryot is bound to contribute either in the shape of labour or money for the part of the work for which he is responsible. If this work is transferred to the Public Works Department, I am afraid the officers of that department will not be competent to carry out the *Kudimaramat* work. Here, again, the officers of the Revenue Department will have to step in and carry out the work of the *Kudimaramat*. I am afraid, Sir, this system of *diarchy* with which the hon. mover started his speech will not work well. I have consulted all the Collectors and all of them are vehement in their opposition to the system of transferring this kind of work to the Public Works Department.”

The motion was put to vote and declared lost.

#### MOTION No. 62.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“The motion that stands in my name runs as follows :—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 8,18,000 for works for which neither capital nor revenue accounts are kept, by Rs. 100.*

“I move for a reduction of grant under this head by Rs. 100. I am glad that this House has vetoed the proposal to omit the whole of the establishment for minor irrigation works, because I attach very great importance to the satisfactory execution of repairs of these irrigation works scattered all over the Presidency. My complaint is that the department has not been doing justice to the paramount necessity of carrying out the repairs to the various irrigation works scattered throughout the Presidency. This is my complaint. I shall presently show that owing to various causes at work which require further examination, the Revenue Department has not been in a position to push through the execution of repairs of the various works, as they ought to be done. It will be remembered that these irrigation works consisting of wells, springs, tanks and works of various description have been out of repair for several years. What the department has been doing is to get the estimates prepared for such of those works which can be repaired with the aid of the establishment already sanctioned and provide men and

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [14th March 1923]

money necessary for that purpose. I would draw the attention of the House to the discussions which took place in this Council in pre-Reform days when we had the right of suggesting increased expenditure under the various heads. Now it is unfortunate that we can ask only for reduction of grants, and not for increased expenditure leaving the Government to suggest increased expenditure. I may remind the House that invariably for five or six years when resolutions were moved in this Council asking for increased expenditure under minor irrigation works, the uniform reply on behalf of the Government was that they could not spend more money, and that therefore there was no necessity for increased allotment for minor irrigation works. The expenditure under this head has been stationary during all these years, somewhere between six and seven lakhs of rupees during all these ten years, sometimes slightly less and sometimes slightly more. It is recognized at the same time that there are several works which are out of repair, they having been repaired several years before.

“In this connexion, I would draw the attention of the hon. the Revenue Member to the unfortunate circumstance that, notwithstanding the enthusiasm which he has now displayed in opposing the motion moved by my hon. friend Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar, we have not been in a position to obtain correct information as to the various irrigation works which are really out of repair. May I also draw his attention to the fact that the Land Revenue Reports published ten years ago supplied us with information districtwar about the irrigation works, enabling us at the same time to understand how many of them were out of repair. With that information before us it was possible for us to judge what measures were taken by the Government for the purpose of repairing those works, which were out of repair. But what do we find now? From the executive orders of the Government, they have now omitted that statement from the Land Revenue Report. Either the Board of Revenue or the Government did not think it best that we should have such information. We find some meagre information furnished in the financial statement No. 19 appended to the Land Revenue Reports. It only gives us the total number of irrigation works. I will take the latest report, in which it is stated that there were 29,007 irrigation works and the number of irrigation works repaired during the official year up to 31st March 1921 was 3,000 and odd. Instead of a detailed information which we had in the past as to the various minor irrigation works in the various districts of this Presidency, we are merely given the total number of irrigation works, and the total number of works repaired. I would like to know from the hon. the Revenue Member how many irrigation works, wells and springs there are in the various districts really out of repair, and whether the number of works to be repaired next year represents at least a correct proportion of the number of works which are yet to be repaired. If he is not in a position to satisfy us that what is necessary for the purpose of repairing small irrigation works has been done, I think it is time that we should request him to go ahead and make better proposals for carrying out the repairs of these minor irrigation works to a larger extent. It may be that an allotment is necessary to that extent; but we are bound to give it. We are having proposals for carrying out major irrigation works, and owing to financial difficulties we have not been able to cope with the demand from the public exchequer; and we are not in a position to carry out the various irrigation projects, which will provide facilities and relief to the ryots to which they are justly entitled. The object of my motion is to impress upon the hon. the Revenue Member

14th March 1923] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

that he must not be merely satisfied with the sum of Rs. 5½ lakhs which have been budgeted for in a stereotyped manner for works. He must have the satisfaction of carrying out those works. He must find more funds, if necessary, to carry out the repairs of minor irrigation works to a larger extent. I may also point out that the suggestion of my hon. friend, Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar, requires a very careful consideration. The establishment charges alone come to Rs. 2,28,000, whereas the amount provided for repairs and maintenance of works is about 6 lakhs. It is quite certain that the establishment charges are quite out of all proportion to the amount really spent."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member is, I fear, not to the point. We are not dealing with establishment charges now. The motion dealing with 'Establishment charges' has been decided just a few minutes back, and I think hon. Members are not entitled to interfere with it now. The hon. Member began by saying: 'I am glad that this House has vetoed the proposal to abolish the establishment'. The majority has taken that view already, and it is not proper that another hon. Member should say anything more with reference to the propriety or otherwise of the decision already arrived at."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"May I point out that I was just dealing with that question in order to show that because we have allotted a sum of Rs. 2,20,000 for the establishment, it is our duty to provide for more allotment for the purpose of repairing the irrigation works? I wanted to impress upon the hon. the Revenue Member that when he has at his disposal for the purpose of carrying out these works a costly establishment at an expenditure of Rs. 2,20,000, it is necessary to show a proper outturn of work."

12 noon. "I think the provision of five or six lakhs is nothing when we have got such establishments for the purpose of carrying out minor irrigation works. If I am right in my contention that a large number of works require repairs and that the provision in the budget is nothing compared to the number of tanks requiring repairs, I think Government ought to change its present policy and ought to provide more funds, at least for minor irrigation works to give some partial relief to the agriculturists."

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI:—"Sir, I wish to say a few words in support of this motion. My complaint is that so little money is spent on works and so much on establishment. The amount allotted for establishment is 2,28,000 and for works about six lakhs. The establishment charges are certainly heavy when compared with the amount allotted for works. If the minor irrigation works are entrusted to the local boards, which have already got sufficient establishment under a qualified man, it may be possible to do away with the supervisors. If necessary, a sub-overseer or two may be appointed to cope with the work if it is heavy. In this connexion, I may submit that the Ceded districts are neglected in this matter also. Very little money has been allotted for minor irrigation works in these districts. There are many tanks there which are out of repair and which require urgent attention. With these few words, I support the motion."

Diwan Bahadur T. N. SIVAGNANAM PILLAI:—"Sir, the complaint is that more money is not spent on works and that out of the amount allotted, a third is spent on establishment. The presumption seems to be that the works are all congregated at one particular place. Take the district of Tinnevely; you will

[Mr. T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai] [14th March 1923]

find that the minor irrigation works are spread all over the district. Eleven supervisors and 127 sub-overseers are provided for the whole Presidency. That would mean that many districts go without a supervisor and that as regards the sub-overseers there will be four or five. Taking all together we must give at least two sub-overseers for each taluk. At present in many cases the lascar is left in charge of the works under the supervision of the sub-overseer who will be travelling over a larger area. In the nature of things it will not be possible to curtail the establishment. If more money is needed for works, it would mean more money is also needed for establishment. What would become of the works that are in need of repairs in other parts of the district if the establishment is all located at one place? So there is that practical difficulty, and the best solution is the present method. If they are handed over to the Public Works Department they have less establishment and they cannot effectively supervise. The Revenue Department is the best supervising agency. So I fail to see that any case has been made out for the reduction of the establishment. If the establishment is reduced it would mean that the number of works also should be reduced. In the nature of things it is impossible to do so."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—  
 "I am glad that a sort of enthusiasm has been displayed by those hon. Members who have spoken on this matter to secure more money for minor irrigation works. Nobody would be gladder than myself if the financial position of the province would permit larger sums being spent on minor irrigation works. That will certainly conduce to the welfare and happiness of the ryot. But we have to cut our coat according to the cloth. The complaint is not that next year we are going to starve these works. The only complaint is that we are more or less remaining stationary and that we do not show anything like an appreciable advance. Following the line of argument adopted by the previous speaker, I should say that if more money were to be spent on minor irrigation works more money would be needed for the purpose of establishment as well. At the present moment, there are districts where there are no more than two overseers employed for the entire area. The Tinnevely district, to which my hon. friend referred, has no more than eight sub-overseers and there are 1,600 tanks situated in the district which are scattered in all parts of the district, a large number of them being inaccessible. If, therefore, the House is asking me to budget for more money I only give them this previous warning that it will probably be necessary for me to ask for money for more establishment as well. However, some time ago Government took pains to find out what the average expenditure on minor irrigation works should be. It was impossible, of course, to decide by any rule of the thumb how much money should be spent in a particular district and how much money should not be spent. However, the Government laid down a certain formula. Every Collector before budgeting for the amount of money required for minor irrigation works was to observe this formula. That formula was that in the case of the wet lands the expenditure should be at the rate of 12 annas per acre and in the case of the single crop land it should be 6 annas per acre. Although this formula was laid down the Collectors were at the same time authorized to budget for more or less, indicating the reason for the departure from the formula. The Collectors are following this rule and there has been no neglect on the part of these officers to maintain minor irrigation works in as good a condition as it has been possible for them to do. My hon. friend complained that the Members did not get enough information

14th March 1923] [Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

was to whether all the works needing repairs have been repaired or not. The other complaint was that the elaborate statistical information that they used to be supplied with has been withheld. I am not quite aware of the exact reason which induced the Government to withhold that information. Probably, there were committees appointed from time to time for the purpose of reducing the bulk of work by omitting from the annual administration reports matters in which the public take little interest. Probably, they have been substituted by triennial or quinquennial reports of administration, thus rendering the administration reports as much readable as possible and omitting the tabular forms. I do not know if this is one of the recommendations of that committee. I might say that it might have been; for in these days we are all economizing expenditure, and if all the volumes of statistical information which should form part and parcel of these reports have to be printed by their thousands, I think the cost of printing will enormously increase.

"Then, Sir, it was contended that these works might as well be handed over to the control of the local fund department with one or two sub-overseers only. It was hinted that the local fund departments had a plethora of staff who can take this additional responsibility as well, and that there was no need for so many men. I do not know, Sir, whether I can accept that suggestion at this stage. I shall reserve my comments till the question is really raised."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, I am not satisfied with what the hon. the Revenue Member has said that all that is necessary has been done for the purpose of improving the minor irrigation works. He gave us the warning that if the object we have in view, of spending more money in minor irrigation works, is to be achieved, it will necessitate his coming to the House with a demand for additional establishment. If we are to realize the necessity for improving irrigation, even if that involves by itself additional expenditure we must be prepared for meeting that additional expenditure. If, I still think, Sir, that it is necessary to press this motion even after the explanation, it is because I think there is keen dissatisfaction in the country that, so far as irrigation is concerned, we have not been able to show any advance or any marked progress.

"I now begin with minor irrigation works and there will be time enough to consider the major irrigation works. It will be remembered that we have provided for increased expenditure in all departments by so many crores. Are not the people justly entitled to complain that no substantial portion of the expenditure has been devoted to the carrying out of the irrigation projects or repairing irrigation works? My hon. friend, the Revenue Member, told us that we must cut our coat according to the cloth. Does this apply only to the allotment for minor irrigation works? If we are not able to limit our expenditure in other increased items, I think it is not correct to say that so far as these irrigation works are concerned we must limit our expenditure. As to the information which is now omitted from the land revenue report, I may inform him that it was formerly done without the help of the committee. A resolution to that effect was moved and adopted in this House. Government then stated: 'we cannot proceed further; we think that the information will not serve any public purpose; we shall give some information in a limited form.' The Council then stated—I hope the

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

[14th March 1923]

hon. Member will refer to the matter and verify it—that meagre information would serve no useful purpose. I hope he will look into the matter again and do the needful.”

The motion was put and lost.

Demand VI was put and carried; and the grant was made.

## DEMAND VII—IRRIGATION—PUBLIC WORKS OFFICERS.

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I move  
12-15 p.m. for a grant not exceeding 52.67 lakhs of rupees—Demand  
VII—Irrigation—Public Works officers ”

## MOTION No. 63.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ Sir, I move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 16,00,000 for working expenses (under irrigation works—Productive) by Rs. 100.*

The case for minor irrigation works having been stated, it now falls to my lot to make a few observations on the question of major productive works which are covered by this grant. Sir, it was expected that in consequence of the Reforms under which the Council is now working, greater liberty would be given to the provincial Governments in the matter of expediting the expansion of productive works in this Presidency. As hon. Members are aware, the powers of Local Government for sanctioning expenditure have been considerably increased after the Reform scheme. Irrigation is now a provincial subject and many of the schemes of expenditure which hitherto went up to the Government of India for sanction are now within the power of the Local Government to sanction. That being so it is a matter of regret to me to find that, during these three years, this question of increased expenditure in the improvement of major productive works like the Gōdāvari and Kistna deltas, has not received that attention of the Government which it ought to. In previous years, I raised the question of improvement of the drainage of the Gōdāvari and Kistna deltas. The matter has been continuously brought in the Council for the last ten or twelve years and the Government of four or five years ago, made out a comprehensive programme of improvement of the drainage works in both the Gōdāvari and the Kistna deltas costing about 20 or 30 lakhs of rupees. They also issued an order stating that these works should be carried out. I regret to find that this budget—I don't speak of the previous budgets—does not show any evidence of increased expenditure on these works. On the other hand, if hon. Members turn to page 30 of the Irrigation Budget, they will find that the working expenses under productive irrigation works for the current year, i.e., 1922-23 come up to Rs. 17 lakhs, and that for the next year a provision of only 16 lakhs is made under this head. I need not at all dilate very much on this aspect of the question. The improvement of drainage, conditions in both these deltas—conditions which have caused enormous loss on account of submersion by floods—is a matter within the knowledge of the district authorities as well as the Government. The question is, why has not this comprehensive programme of improvement of drainage works been carried out? The hon. the Law Member speaking on the previous motions referred to the present financial condition of this province. Well, Sir, the present financial condition of this

14th March 1923] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

province is a very convenient excuse for many purposes. But hon. Members are aware that increased expenditure on major productive works comes entirely from loan funds. We have been borrowing money within the last two or three years and even next year the hon. the Finance Member has budgeted for loans for various works of public utility. May I ask the hon. Member whether he does not consider irrigation works as works of public utility, and why he has not taken steps to see that this programme, which has been laid down four or five years ago after considerable agitation from those districts, or even a portion of it is not given effect to in this Budget? Sir, I should like to bring to the notice of hon. Members of this House that no difficulty is felt in finding money for the purpose of drainage works and water-supply schemes in municipalities, for the Cochin harbour, for the improvement of the Cooum and various other purposes mentioned in the Budget. But the grievances of these ryots who are suffering from difficulties of drainage have not received any attention. I, therefore, ask the hon. Member to see that, whatever might have happened in the past, at least a portion of the programme for the improvement of drainage in the two deltas of Gōdāvari and Kistna with which I have some intimate knowledge, is given effect to.

"The second point which I wish to mention is with reference to the silt-clearance of the canals. My hon. friend, Mr. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu, in his speech on the Budget a few days ago, referred to the extreme case of the silt congestion in the Samalkot canal of the Gōdāvari delta. He said that the municipality had to repair it at their own cost for leading the water from Samalkot to Cocanada, a distance of ten miles, for the purpose of feeding the municipal water works at Cocanada. I wish to know whether that is a compliment to the Public Works Department. There has been a complaint that silt-clearing has been neglected, and even in this present Budget I see that the allotment for maintenance is not satisfactory. Taking the Gōdāvari, for instance, we find that the provision of Rs. 4,70,000 is reduced to Rs. 4,21,700. The fact remains that silt-clearing has been neglected for the last two or three years. Works which yield a good return on the capital outlay should not be neglected.

"A third matter to which I wish to invite the attention of the hon. Members is with reference to the establishment. On account of retrenchment of various kinds, some of the subdivisions in the deltas have been abolished. Many of the sections in charge of overseers who are the officers in direct charge of the water have also been abolished. I brought this fact to the notice of the Government about four or five months ago. I informed the Government that the *mamool* of these officers has considerably increased in consequence of the retrenchment policy of the Government in this department. I said so in a letter which I addressed to the Chief Engineer and I asked him to look into the matter carefully. In the interests of the ryots, it is better to see that the present policy of retrenchment in regard to the removal of these officers in charge of public works is reconsidered. The result of cutting down the establishments has been that subdivisions and sections have been made too large and the ryots cannot conveniently reach the officers whenever they want water. They have to run after the officers for 40 or 50 miles before they can see them. The arrangements before the retrenchment had been working for many years. Till last year the idea had been that each of these section officers should have twenty thousand acres under his charge for purposes of distribution of water. This has been the

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [14th March 1923]

result of continuous work of 10 or 15 years. The present policy of retrenchment, in cutting down these sections and divisions, has again brought about the very evils which once existed.

“These are the three points which I wish the hon. the Law Member to consider and I trust in these three directions, namely, carrying out a comprehensive scheme of drainage in the deltas, undertaking silt-clearing and solving the question of establishment, some attention will be devoted. I am perfectly certain that there are other hon. Members who may be willing to say something on the other projects which are included under this head.”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“Mr. President, Sir, I shall deal with the matters dealt with by my hon. friend, Mr. Ramachandra Rao, in the order he has adopted. First, with regard to the general complaint that there has been no progressive policy in productive works, I hope my hon. friend will appreciate the limits which are placed on the loan policy of this Government. Limits are imposed by the Government of India as to the maximum that should be allotted to this Government with regard to loans.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“May I know what the figure is?”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“One hundred and twenty-five lakhs is the maximum that will be spared to us. It is not that we won't ask for more. It is in order to emphasise the point that this Government have not been unmindful of their obligations in this respect and of the right lines of progress that I desire to advert to this subject, namely, that there are limits laid down with regard to the loan capacity of this Government, beyond which we cannot go. I may at once mention, Mr. President, that this Government have been anxious to expedite these schemes. I may also mention that if in the Budget for the next year no project has been brought forward under the heads to which reference was made by my hon. friend, Mr. Ramachandra Rao, it is simply because it is not possible to get the things through during the course of the year. We cannot have the things done in the course of the year under review. Having regard to the fact that our loan capacity is limited and having regard also to the paramount importance of this branch of administration, this Government have been willing, and are willing, to extend their irrigation policy to the utmost possible limits of expediency.

“As to silt-clearing, I may give certain figures to indicate that far from going backward in regard to that, there has been considerable progress. So far as the year 1923-24 is concerned, Rs. 1,14,000 have been set apart for Gōdāvari and Rs. 1,42,000 for Kistna as against the corresponding figures of Rs. 1,05,000 and Rs. 1,41,000 in the previous year. In regard to this aspect of the matter it may be said that our programme of work is strictly limited to our financial capacities. As regards Cocanada, to which reference was made, it will be noticed that it stands on a different footing by itself. The canal runs practically through the municipality and there are many complications with regard to that matter.

“Then, as regards the retrenchment policy, which, according to my friend, has led to untoward results and unforeseen exactions, no doubt it is a point to which attention has to be paid; but it will be remembered by my hon. friend and Members of this House that it was a ruthless policy of retrenchment that was resorted to and that it was this House that was responsible for

14th March 1923] [Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar]

it. I am sure, Government are grateful to my hon. friend for having brought these circumstances to their notice. I shall conclude, as I began, by saying that in this matter it will be the endeavour of this Government to pursue a forward policy, but they are at present limited solely by their financial capacities."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" Mr. President, I was not able to understand the hon. the Law Member when he said that the financial capacities of this Government are limited with regard to pushing forward schemes of irrigation. I do not for a moment admit that the Government's capacity to borrow is limited or can be limited by the Government of India. As long as the Government of India is looked to as the sole creditor, they may indicate their own terms; and as long as this Government has been budgeting for deficits, they may put their own limitations. But my question is how much of the 125 lakhs allowed by the India Government was utilized by the Madras Government. According to the Budget I find that in the current year they proposed to borrow 115 lakhs and that there is a deficit of 10 lakhs under this head. They could have freely borrowed the 10 lakhs and utilised it for irrigation projects. We were told that our deficit Budget would not be as large as it appeared and that there would be a saving of 30 lakhs. I do not see the reason why Government should not borrow the 30 lakhs and utilise it for irrigation projects. If really the Government is bent upon a policy of carrying out good irrigation projects I do not think that there will be any limitations put on them. On the other hand, we notice that the Bombay Government has launched upon the Sukkur project and they are going to borrow the required amount. When such is the case, I am not able to understand how the hon. Member for Irrigation can justify the present policy of Government in borrowing only 9 lakhs for irrigation when there is so much latitude allowed to them in the matter."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, the hon. the Law Member said that he was as anxious as anybody else to push forward many schemes of irrigation, but that he was hampered by the limitations of the Government of India. Even so, is it not his duty to distribute the amount that is placed at his disposal among the several districts in proportion to their needs? I should like to know what he has done now with regard to poorer districts which are more in need of irrigation schemes than any other part of the Presidency? Am I to understand that he has no projects at all that are mature or ready for execution? If he says so he cannot be right. So, I wish to know from him what portion of this amount he has earmarked for being spent on the poorer districts."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I wish to ascertain from the hon. the Law Member before he can satisfy this House as to the policy of the Government in respect to this question and as to what attempts have been made during the last ten years to secure funds for the purpose of carrying out these irrigation works. I am suggesting ten years because I remember that this question was agitated in 1913 when a resolution was moved by me asking that definite steps should be taken for improving the irrigation of the Pennar canals and the Kurnool-Cuddapah canals. I remember that Mr. Clarke, who was then in charge of irrigation, replying on behalf of the Government, gave a succinct account of the various steps taken by Government for the purpose of improving the irrigation of those canals, and finally

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [14th March 1923]

accepted the resolution. I shall only ask the hon. the Law Member to examine whether any *bona fide* and earnest attempts have been made since the acceptance of this resolution for providing adequate funds to improve the irrigation systems referred to in that resolution as well as other irrigation systems in the Presidency. It is also necessary to inquire whether even within the limitations to which the Government are subject they have been making efforts to secure adequate funds, whether they have failed in those attempts, and, if so, why they have failed, whether they have made representations to the Government of India and whether they were not successful in getting that amount necessary for carrying out the irrigation schemes. There is not the slightest doubt that the whole country will agitate so far as that matter is concerned. Before the hon. the Law Member satisfies that the Government have taken the necessary steps, it is absolutely essential that he should place before us more information as to the definite steps taken by Government in respect of this matter and the funds which they were able to secure and the reasons which have led to their failure. It is only after a full explanation of these circumstances that we can agree to accept this motion."

Sriman SASIEHUSHAN RATH Mahasayo:—"Sir, with regard to the distribution of money for irrigation schemes, it is very unfortunate that Ganjam should not be given the consideration that it deserves. We have only eighteen projects in Ganjam that have been investigated and none of them have been cared for. In answer to a resolution of Mr. Patro, two years back, the hon. the Revenue Member promised that the first project in the Presidency will be the Bordapalle project. Again, in answer to an interpellation of Mr. Abdur-Rahman Sahib, the hon. the Revenue Member said that the Girisola project would be taken up. I wish to know what became of the promises to these hon. gentlemen. Now, we heard of quite another scheme as being investigated: the Nirumapalle reservoir scheme. What is the object of these investigations, if the projects that were already investigated are not put into execution? I therefore request the hon. the Law Member to consider the cost of the projects already investigated and give effect to the Girisola project or the Bordapalle project immediately as unless this is done the Ganjam people will not be satisfied and the Rushikulya system will not be productive."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"Sir, I rise to raise my protest against the undue distribution of money without considering the wants of the different districts. My hon. friend, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, has already informed the House that the hon. the Law Member has not given due consideration to the needs of the different districts, especially the famine-affected areas of this Presidency. That being so, I am sorry that no attention whatever has been paid to the irrigation works of the Ganjam district. It was two years back that the hon. the Revenue Member, who was then in charge of Irrigation, informed us that immediate attention would be paid to supplement the Rushikulya system, and he was also kind enough to accept the resolution of Mr. Patro (now the hon. Mr. Patro) and to do his best to take up, if I remember aright, the Bordapalle project. That was afterwards given up, and we were told that they were going to take up the Girisola project. Just after five months even the Girisola project was given up, and I do not know why and for what reasons Government came to this conclusion. Inquiries are still going on and we do not know what conclusions they will arrive at. If investigation of works will take

14th March 1923] [Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo]

three, four and five years, I am sure no benefit will be done to the people. I would therefore request the Government to make up its mind to take up some work at least this year out of the eighteen works that have been investigated and for which papers, I hear, are ready."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, the fact that three or four members representing various districts have spoken on this motion shows the importance of Government having a forward and strong irrigation policy both for productive and protective works, and I trust that this debate at least will induce my hon. friend, the Law Member, to formulate such a policy. We have been speaking of irrigation projects for the last fifteen or twenty years, and hon. Members who represent the Deltaic districts as well as other districts have always ventilated their grievances here; but I am sorry to say that notwithstanding my optimism we have not made any clear headway in this matter. It might be that it was partly due to the limitation placed by the Government of India in regard to obtaining funds. But when irrigation is a provincial subject and the powers of borrowing are definitely laid down, and the Government have access not only to the Government of India but also to the open market for obtaining funds, there can no longer be any delay in pushing these projects all round, both in the famine-affected areas and also in districts where these productive projects can be started.

"Having said that, I do not wish to press this motion to a division. I should only like to invite the attention of the hon. Members to the Local Government Borrowing Rules, where they say that the Local Government may borrow to meet any class of expenditure on irrigation under rules in force before the passing of the Act from out of loan funds. I do not really understand what the hon. the Law Member means when he says that the Government of India has fixed a limit of 125 lakhs. Is it under Rule 3, where they say the amount can be fixed by the Local Government? Or, is it that the Government of India have stated that they will only be able to make a loan to this Government up to 125 lakhs? Or, is it a fact that the Government of India have definitely stated that the Local Government cannot borrow more than 125 lakhs in a single year? What really is the situation I should like to know definitely from the hon. the Law Member.

"Sir, the feeling is so strong in this House that it is easy for me to carry this motion; but in withdrawing it, I trust the hon. Member in charge of the subject, simply because the motion is withdrawn, will not leave the matter where it is and wake himself up to it next year by this time. Sir, in 1921 when this Council was started I brought this important matter to the notice of the hon. Mr. Habib-ul-lah who was then in charge of the subject. He said he did not know much about it and it is now two years since promises have been made, and to-day we are told by various Members that promises have been held out that something would be done for the Ganjam district, something for the famine zones of which my hon. friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar is anxious. How is any advance to be made unless the Local Government has got a definite policy of putting a certain amount every year on the irrigation projects, both productive and protective? We have gained liberty by the constitutional reforms and that should be availed of for the sake of pushing

12-45 p.m.

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [14th March 1923]

forward schemes of irrigation in which the people are greatly interested. I trust the Government will lose no time. It is now already three years. As the electorate has been referred to on the last occasion, I should like to ask any hon. Member whether he has persuaded the Government to start one single new project though the Government can borrow funds for the purpose and need not depend on its own resources."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I do not desire to detain the House long. But I want to mention that so far as the Ganjam projects are concerned, the Rishikulya project has been investigated ; the investigation of the Girisola project has also been completed and the estimate is ready."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" Sir, may I know what amount of money has been sanctioned for the Ganjam works from this year's expenditure?"

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" I said, Sir, the estimates were about to be sanctioned."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" I wish to know, Sir, what the Government can afford to spare for Ganjam irrigation works from this year's expenditure."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" Mr. President, I said the Girisola project had been sanctioned and the estimates were about to be sanctioned. My hon. friend will realize that I have not got the actual figures on hand."

" As for the remarks that fell from Mr. Krishna Rao with regard to the attempts made during the last ten years, he has probably forgotten that from 1914 there has been a strict embargo laid upon this Government and from the ten years' period, this fairly big slice of years must be taken away."

" As for the Ceded districts, of which my hon. friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar has been a stout champion, the hon. the Revenue Member has given him hopes in regard to the money that will be set apart. Investigations will go on and as soon as they are complete, steps will be taken to put them in execution. It must be remembered that there are no schemes ready enough to be included in the Budget by way of relief to the famine stricken districts."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I beg to say, Sir, that the head we are now dealing with relates to productive works. That being so, I beg to inform the hon. the Law Member that there is a scheme for the extension of the Basavanna channel for about two lakhs and the estimate has been sent. That is my information. If it has not already come to him I daresay it will be coming soon, and I wish that he kindly bears it in mind and provides money for it."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" Of course, when the estimate comes before me, I am sure to look into the matter."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" May I be permitted, Sir, to explain the position? As hon. Members are aware, there are two ways in which we can borrow. We may either go to the Government of India, or we may go to the open market. If we choose to raise a loan in the open market, there are limitations which the Government of India may impose on us. As hon. Members are aware, some Local Governments have gone to the

14th March 1923]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

local market. But the Local Governments have to go there after the Government of India have done their borrowing, and they have to borrow at a higher rate than the Government of India. Besides, they have to pay interest on the loan pending the utilization of the amount borrowed. I would ask further hon. Members to consider whether we can borrow a crore and a quarter in the open market in Madras at the rate at which the Government of India borrow, or at any rate. I have taken expert advice on the matter and understand that we should not get the amount unless we paid a much higher rate of interest. I therefore put it to the House that we are very much better off if we borrow from the Government of India. We were pressing the Government of India for a much larger amount than they were willing to give. We got the amount raised to a crore and a quarter. I hope with the loan which they are going to float this year they will be willing to listen to any proposals we may make for increasing the loan to us. That is why we want to get proposals ready, so that we may tell them that, if they get more than their 25 crores, we would be glad to take a certain further sum from them. There is a further advantage in this course. For, what we really do is to overdraw on our bankers and we pay interest on the outstandings from year to year. It is therefore advantageous as we are not obliged to pay interest even before we utilize the money. As regards finding money for irrigation from loans, for productive works, nobody would be gladder than I to invest as much as possible in investments which will yield as much as 18 per cent or anything over and above the rate of interest we have to pay for the money."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I rise to inform the hon. Member that I am heartily at one with him with regard to borrowing from the Government of India. He knows my views on the matter. All that I say is that the matter must be pressed. I am certain we are thankful to the hon. Member for doing what he has done and I hope he would do better."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 64.

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—"Sir, I move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,00,540 for maintenance and repairs for irrigation works (unproductive) by 20,000.*

Sir, my object in moving this motion for reduction is to emphasize one or two facts. First of all, there is a feeling in this country, supported by the criticism of the Accountant-General in his public accounts, that the supervision is very inadequate with the result that there is a wastage of material and very often unusual and unnecessary delays. Therefore this department requires a good deal of shaking up. Then only, can we have better supervision and some saving also, and some funds may be released for productive works. Secondly, Sir, the allotting of a certain amount and the manner of spending it looks like a matter of routine—an arrangement to keep up the establishment and the army of contractors. There is also the disposition, thirdly, to make the repairs in a very careless and flimsy manner. If the repairs could be more solid and substantial,

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar] [14th March 1923]

I think that after a few years there would be no necessity for constant renewals and repairs. Therefore, I think there is room for reduction here."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"I can understand, Mr. President, a motion like the one which the House has just been discussing, a motion for the reduction of the grant by Rs. 100 or Re. 1 for the purpose of raising questions akin to those which have been adumbrated by my hon. friend who has just sat down. But I may venture to tell him this, the method he has gone about to adopt, namely, the proposal for a reduction by Rs. 20,000, a fairly substantial sum out of a Budget allotment, which it has been practically unanimously felt as inadequate for the purpose of the Government, is, I may submit with all possible respect, the wrong way to go about.

"So far as the specific matters which have been adverted to by the hon. Member, I think we are indebted to him for pointing out the possibilities in which money might be slipping away. But I think at the same time I must say that he has done no more than pointing out these possibilities. If any specific instances of such irregularities or shoddy or shabby work as has been rightly objected to by the hon. Member are brought to the notice of the Government, the hon. Member may be quite sure that no step will be left for doing away with such things. I appeal to him not to press this motion which is for the reduction of an already inadequate budget provision."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 65.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, I move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,00,540 for maintenance and repairs for irrigation works (unproductive) by Rs. 100.*

Sir, this motion is practically covered by the previous one and it relates to unproductive works. It is a difference in classification. The works which we were dealing with in the previous motion of mine are works which are classed as productive. This motion relates to unproductive works on which the stipulated rate of interest is not being received, works like the Rushikulya project and the Nagavalli project. Even here there is room for considerable improvement in expenditure. Just now, my hon. friend, Mr. Das, mentioned that a certain definite scheme for the improvement of the Rushikulya project has not been carried. I think that even with reference to these works, which under our classification are called unproductive, they are works on which considerable outlay has already been incurred, works of irrigation of considerable importance like the Rushikulya project, the Nagavalli, Havani and Muniyalu projects. I think there is justification for incurring more expenditure."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Mr. President, I am at one with Mr. Ramachandra Rao in saying that there is room for more expenditure in this direction. In fact, under this head, the grant proposed by the department was less than the department is able to get. The Government are mindful of the circumstance that a forward and progressive policy is quite necessary."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

14th March 1923]

MOTION No. 66.

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move  
1 p.m. the following motion which stands in my name :—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,53,092 for works for which neither capital nor revenue accounts are kept by Rs. 3.66 lakhs.*

Sir, my object in giving notice of this motion is this. We find that a sum of about 22½ lakhs has been provided for unproductive works in charge of the Public Works Department. In view of the fact that the provision made under Minor Irrigation works is only about 6 lakhs, and there are repeated protests, complaints and requests from the public that the case of minor irrigation works is most important and that their repair and maintenance is absolutely necessary, I think a sum of Rs. 3.66 lakhs may be cut out from the said unproductive works and utilized for minor irrigation works. I myself repeatedly made requests that minor irrigation works should be better attended to. There are about 40 thousand minor irrigation works in the whole of this Presidency, and the Irrigation Commission has emphasised the necessity of attending to the repair and maintenance of such works and they said that a sum of Rs. 20 lakhs should be spent for that purpose. That was in the old days when the value of the rupee was high, but now at present the value of that Rs. 20 lakhs would be even double or treble and the works themselves in many cases have since very much deteriorated. I find no adequate provision made for minor irrigation and no proper attention has been hitherto paid to it by the department concerned. I think that the unproductive works for which the sum of about 22½ lakhs has been provided cannot be said to be more important than minor irrigation works, and this amount of 22½ lakhs can be reduced by Rs. 3.66 lakhs and the latter amount utilized for minor irrigation works, the importance of which cannot be over-rated. I want information from the Government on the matter of the attention paid to the urgent necessity of repairs and improvements required for the minor irrigation works."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" If my hon. friend will wait a little and finishes his speech, I shall give fairly sufficient information as to what the programme of the Government is on the matter. But I may mention at once, as he has asked for information, that the Government are alive to the necessity and the expediency of attending to minor irrigation works. But what the hon. mover now asks is the reduction of 3.66 lakhs out of a total allotment of about 22½ lakhs, and I am going to justify that we do want that money and more under this Budget head, and that is what I am endeavouring to show. Undoubtedly the object is laudable, but I am afraid the remedy suggested seems difficult for me to appreciate."

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI :—" My object is not the reduction of expenditure on irrigation works, but I want to know whether there is any definite policy laid down in regard to the maintenance and repair of minor irrigation works, what measures the Government have taken up till now and what they are going to do hereafter."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, it seems to me that the question, undoubtedly an important question, raised by my hon. friend, Mr. Shanmukham Pillai, was perhaps more appropriate to have been raised when the subject of minor irrigation was on the tapis. But he has chosen another method, namely, that of endeavouring to starve this

[Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar]

[14th March 1923]

department by 3.66 lakhs, which is not a nominal reduction but a substantial one. But I may mention that so far as this particular head is concerned, the original demand made by the department was considerably larger, and it is because we are not able to get more than this particular amount of 22½ lakhs, we have provided only so much. Now it may be noted that there are further applications for additional grants under this head, aggregating to 1.87 lakhs, which have since been received from local officers. It is therefore possible to spend more and much more under this head than what has been provided for it now, and I would ask my hon. friend not to press this motion in its present form, but to take some other and more adequate opportunity to raise the extremely important question to which he has drawn attention”.

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI:—“I am satisfied, Sir, and I do not want to press my motion”.

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 67.

Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI:—“Sir, I beg to move the motion standing against my name, that is—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,53,092 for irrigation works by Rs. 100.*

Sir, the object of my giving notice of this motion is to invite the attention of the Government and also of the House to the scant attention that is paid to the matter of providing irrigation facilities to what is known as the famine zone in this Presidency. I have searched in vain in the Irrigation Budget supplement that has been given to me for any appreciable provision for the Ceded districts. Not only that, what I would also complain here about is that there is no definite policy laid out with regard to the irrigation schemes in this famine zone. If a certain quantity of money is available under this head, I think preference ought to be given to these backward districts which are always affected with distress conditions. I would ask the hon. the Member in charge of Irrigation to make this a definite policy. Supposing there is an amount of Rs. 100 to be spent under Irrigation, I would suggest a certain percentage, say 25 per cent, must be spent for providing irrigation facilities for these backward tracts, and the rest may be disposed of in the manner the Government likes. That is the policy which I would recommend that the Government should adopt in this matter. What is still worse is, unfortunately in my district, under the Kudimaramat Act a lot of unlawful levy is being made. I brought this to the notice of the Government by means of an interpellation five or six months ago, but it was answered in a slipshod fashion. The question put by me was:

Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(1) in how many villages of the Anantapur district levies were made under the Kudimaramat Act and what the amount collected is from each and for what purpose, in each of the three faslis ending with 1331;

(2) whether a sum of about Rs. 700 was levied and collected from the villagers of Kuruvollapalli, hamlet of Rampuram, Penukonda taluk; and

(3) what the circumstances justifying the levy of the sum are, for what purposes was the sum levied, and whether the purpose for which it was levied has been accomplished, and if so, to what extent; and if not, why not?

14th March 1923]

[Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai]

“This was a circumstance which came to my notice, and I brought this to the notice of the Government five or six months ago, and it was only sought to be answered in a half-hearted manner, as follows:

The Government have no information but will call for it

From these circumstances, it seems to me, Sir, that my district is made not only to suffer for want of sufficient irrigation facilities, but on the poor ryots is imposed the additional burden of having to pay these levies. These levies are pretended to be made under the Kudimaramat Act. The Act provides for the levy under two circumstances. One is in the case of inundation. My district has only an average rainfall of 22 or 23 inches, and not more than that, and even this is ill-distributed and is not timely. For the last five or six years there was not even this quantity and there could be no inundation, but yet this additional levy is made, it would appear, at the instance of the Public Works Department. It was not at the instance of the ordinary Revenue Department but that of the Public Works Department. The other circumstance under which the levy is justified is whenever there is a custom among the villagers to attend to certain kinds of work. I am not aware of any such custom in my district; especially when a supply channel or a tank-bed is overgrown with rank vegetation, it is never said to be the custom for the ryots to attend to it. My complaint is firstly that sufficient provision is not made for irrigation facilities and secondly that additional levies are made on the poor ryots under the Kudimaramat Act. It is with the object of bringing these to the notice of the Government that I have given notice of this motion.”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—“Sir, the hon. Member who has just spoken has emphasised the necessity of paying special attention to what he called the famine zone. If I may say so, there is not much difference of opinion or of policy regarding that matter, and if money becomes available, as I hope it will be, those schemes which have been investigated and are in a fairly ready stage in regard to that zone will be attended to, though it is impossible to lay down any such hard and fast percentage scale as has been suggested by my hon. friend. With regard to the *kudimaramat*, the matter is engaging the attention of the Government and it will be investigated. Though there has been some delay, I think, the hon. Member will be furnished with the necessary information very shortly, and steps will be taken to see that the grievances he complains of are remedied.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 68.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—“Sir, I move the following motion:—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,31,689 for irrigation, navigation, embankment and drainage works for which neither capital nor revenue accounts are kept by Rs. 100.*

Sir, I really wish to ascertain from the hon. Member in charge whether it is under this head that the cost of repairs to the irrigation works which recently breached in the southern districts has been incurred. I am not quite sure whether this is the head under which expenditure for repair of works in which there were breaches, as those that occurred in the southern districts last September is to be debited. Hon. Members will notice from

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [14th March 1923]

page 59 of the budget that there is practically no difference in the figures under this head, for the amount was Rs. 6,57,000 for 1922-23, and it is put down as Rs. 6,65,000 for 1923-24. But the definite information I would like to ask for is as to whether any expenditure has been incurred in connexion with the restoration of irrigation works which have breached in the southern districts, and if any expenditure has been incurred, under what other head it is shown in this budget."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"Sir, the particular amount which my hon. friend referred to regarding the repair of the breached irrigation works, does not come under this head. If my hon. friend will look at page 59 of the budget, he will find the general head 'Other revenue expenditure financed from ordinary revenues,' and the amount referred to by him would come under that."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 69.

Mr. C. V. VEKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, I move the following motion :—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 29,54,955 for other revenue expenditure financed from ordinary revenues by Rs. 1,000.*

Sir, before stating why I wanted to move this reduction, I just want to say a few words. I think we should express our thanks to the hon. the Minister in charge of the Public Works Department and other Members of the Cabinet for having appointed an experienced Indian as the Chief Engineer for Irrigation. But we may say that those thanks are not chiefly on the question of economy, but on the hope that his services will be fully utilised in improving the irrigation of the Presidency in the very near future, and if that is not done, there will be very great disappointment from all sides.

"Coming to this question, it is very difficult to draw the line between the various departments that deal with this question of irrigation. I said yesterday that the Ministers have got one nation-killing department, that is Excise. But if there is one nation-building department out of their hands it is Irrigation. So far as irrigation works are concerned, we can easily call it triarchy instead of diarchy (laughter). I am not exaggerating facts. I find, thank God, one small provision in this budget for the repair of a tank in the Coimbatore district. That tank has a large area under it irrigated, and there was a breach in it. The Revenue Department was said to be dealing with the question, as also the Public Works Department. I wanted something to be done in the matter of repair of the tank and raised a question about it two years ago. The matter was under correspondence between three departments of the Secretariat, namely, the Revenue Department, then the Irrigation Department and then the Public Works Department, and after two years of correspondence they have been able to give about Rs. 10,000 for the repair of this tank.

"All that I would say, Sir, is this : whatever may be the obligations of the Government to construct large irrigation works, they are under moral obligation so far as these small projects are concerned, especially so far as the restoration of tanks is concerned which has been very much neglected ; and I think the sooner something is done

1-15 p.m.

14th March 1923] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

the better. I do not want to echo the feelings of my hon. friend Mr. Sivasankaram Pillai in raising inter-district questions. A good deal of time is now spent in the Assembly on inter-provincial questions. Our main object should be a continuity of policy in getting more and more money for irrigation, and once, more money is got, we are sure to get more money for every district in all its branches. It may be some of the districts are famine-stricken to-day, and it is the absolute duty of the Government to get them bettered. At the same time also, they should take care not to add to the list of those famine districts more places by neglect of irrigation schemes. As I see, Sir, in my district, the complaint is not want of rain, the complaint is not against God, but the complaint is against the Government. Yesterday, the hon. Mr. Knapp when dealing with the Forest department was saying that a large portion of the work of the department was protection work. So far as our district is concerned, there is one District Forest Officer for the small taluk of Kollegal, and all the water that comes by rainfall flows over to the Tanjore district or the adjacent state of Mysore, and we have nothing at all left to enjoy. I have raised this question also in interpellations and the Government have been pleased to say that the matter is under consideration. Long consideration indeed! I hope that some good result will soon come out of it. Anyhow, it is something gratifying to see that this year the allotment for works under the first class has been raised to Rs. 4·35 lakhs. Our grievance still seems to be the high expenditure incurred on establishment; that is to say it costs as much as 50 per cent as the repairs that are necessary, and thus a very large item out of the money necessary for repairs is taken away. It is desirable that the establishment should be cut down; or if you want to have the establishment there as it is, you should increase the number of works and carry out more repairs where it is necessary. So, we will certainly be glad if it is increased by ten times four lakhs in this year, and a supplementary grant, would not be grudged so far as the question of irrigation is concerned, whatever may be our views on other points. We are glad to see that the position is much more satisfactory than it was before. If our Excise Minister wants more money, he must give more money to the drinking classes, the coolies, and if the coolie is to get more money more grain should be produced which will be the case only if there is better irrigation. So the whole question moves in a circle. So far as this one question is concerned, it is necessary that all the heads of the Ministers and Members should be put together to see some substantial increase made not in the budget of 1924-25 but in the budget of 1923-24 itself. It is not to be left till the Retrenchment Committee is able to make a present to us of some money. I see the three hon. Members opposite sitting together and talking together, and I hope that these three gentlemen will at once combine together to give us an announcement now."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"May I venture to make a general observation before I deal with this particular matter? Did I understand my hon. friend to contend that we should combine to bring in supplementary grants . . . ?"

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I will wait for the result and then say, Sir."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"If all that he asks for from what he has been pleased to call as 'triarchy' is an application for a

[Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar] [14th March 1923]

supplementary grant, at the earliest next occasion possible I think no efforts will be spared to ask for a supplementary grant if things are progressing satisfactorily, as I hope they will.

"Now, with regard to the tank restoration parties my hon. friend and the House will remember that on account of the general retrenchment carried out the tank restoration parties were absolutely abolished, and there are only five sub-divisions now working, and it is that circumstance which I thought my hon. friend did not sufficiently advert to in the remarks that he has been pleased to lay before the House. Now, it will be noticed that in regard to this particular head we asked for more than we got. With regard to tank restoration, we have got a budget allotment of Rs. 3 lakhs and we wish that it is utilised as best as we can, but I do not say that more will be utilised for the Coimbatore district. But it will be utilised to the best possible extent."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I see, Sir, that my hon. friend Mr. Vellingiri Goundar has tabled a resolution to the effect that more money should be spent on tank restoration, and I hope, Sir, that not three lakhs but thirty lakhs will be spent, so that each district might get one lakh. Then, Sir, there will be time enough to thank of the 'triarchy'. I withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 70.

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"I beg to move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 29,54,955 for other revenue expenditure financed from ordinary revenues by Rs. 100.*

The item of expenditure in question now is one which is met from ordinary revenues, and therefore I believe that Government will have nothing to say relating to their capacity for loans. Sir, after the Reforms, the Government of Madras have got increased revenue at least to the extent of 40 per cent, besides the provincial contribution, and I am sorry to note here that the amount of money that is allotted under this head does not show any sign of enhancement. In the year 1921-22 we had Rs. 24,05,000; for the coming year we have got Rs. 23.66 lakhs, and in the year 1922-23, we had much less. It is therefore very clear that Government have not realized their duty towards irrigation works and have not kept their pace along with the increased revenue which they got from the financial settlement with the Central Government. In this connexion, it is desirable also to know what other provinces have done regarding irrigation. India, fortunately or unfortunately, is an agricultural country, and Madras is more so. Looking under the column of net area under cultivation or the cropped area according to the latest returns, we see that Madras has 3,176,000 acres out of which only 9 lakhs have been irrigated. Looking for the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh we have 3,152,000 acres of land of which 1,120,000 have got facilities for irrigation."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"May I ask as to the figures read out whether it is lakhs or millions?"

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"So far as my recollection goes it is lakhs. I should be glad if they are millions."

14th March 1923] [Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo]

“Then, the Punjab has got 19 lakhs of acres of cultivated land of which 11,87,000 have irrigation facilities. These figures, be they millions or lakhs, do not augur well for Madras. So, I would request the Government to pay more attention to this item of expenditure and to the irrigation works which have been very rightly called by my hon. friend from Coimbatore the nation-building activities of the Government. With these words, I make my motion.”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“The Government realizes that in this Reserved department, at all events, there will absolutely be no distinction between one aspect and another, and it is with that hope that the Government have taken the lines they have. The remarks that fell from the hon. Member will be carefully attended to, though I am afraid the figures are not convincing. It seems to me that a cipher from them was dropped out somewhere.”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU (who had also tabled a similar motion as above) then said :—“I wish to have, Sir, your ruling whether this is to be treated as a separate motion from mine. On the last occasion at the time of the budget, the point was specifically raised whether if a number of motions for reduction of a grant by a similar figure, say, Rs. 100, are to be moved, they are to be treated as one or different motions. I think the ruling was that they are to be treated as separate motions.”

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—“I think we can now regard these motions as one for the sake of economizing time.”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“That was a point of order which I wanted to make clear before speaking on this motion.

“The point regarding which I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Member for Irrigation is that as he has shown considerable enthusiasm in assuring hon. Members of this House that he will push through irrigation projects, he will see his way to remove certain difficulties which really lie in the way of carrying out all these irrigation projects. We have been told, and we have received with satisfaction the assurance that the hon. the Law Member would even try to come up before this House for a supplementary grant, if need be, for the purpose of pushing through irrigation schemes. I wish to point out certain difficulties, because I fear that unless these difficulties are solved, the Government will not be in a position to make headway in carrying out their irrigation policy. The Government have adopted a classification into productive and non-productive works which I may point out really lies in the way of carrying out useful projects. They have adopted a classification whereby unless the interest on the capital works out at nearly 6 per cent it is to be treated as a productive work; and they having adopted that classification, we have been handicapped in pressing the Government the need for taking up certain irrigation projects. I will illustrate it by referring to a few concrete examples. There is one project known as the Vangalapuram project in the Nellore district. It has been under investigation for several years, then the plans and estimates have been sanctioned, and the Government have been pleased to assure us that if the ryots are prepared to pay more than the usual water cess of Rs. 4 an acre, a rate somewhat higher than the usual rate, to meet the interest on the capital outlay, the scheme will be taken up. Some inquiries were made through the Agricultural Department, and most of the persons concerned agreed to pay

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [14th March 1923]

water cess not at the old rate of Rs. 4 an acre but at Rs. 10 or Rs. 12½, and signed statements were also taken from several persons affected. Notwithstanding that, I regret to learn that the Government have not been in a position to push forward that scheme any further, because they find that even with a water-rate of over Rs. 12, i.e., three times the usual rate, it would not cover their conventional rules of getting the interest on the capital. If really the Government are sincere in doing anything for the good of the agriculturist, let them only consider and lay down what reasonable amount can be fixed as water cess to be levied from the people; and let it not be an oppressive rate but a reasonable rate, a rate which the people concerned can pay with profit to themselves and with profit to the Government. If once the Government are in a position to satisfy themselves that with due consideration to the difficulties of the ryots and with due consideration to their troubles a certain rate is reasonable, the Government must be in a position to find the extra cost required for the carrying out of the irrigation project. If they do not accept this position, I may inform this House that all their sympathy for carrying out irrigation projects will not produce good results. There is a limit to the amount of water cess to be levied, and let that limit be fixed with due consideration to the conditions of the locality. Having done that, let not the Government turn round and say that it does not get its interest of 5 per cent or whatever percentage it may be. But the extra cost which is necessary must be borne by the Government. Unless such a system is adopted, our sympathy and our enthusiasm for irrigation projects will be merely in vain and we will not be able to produce any substantial result.

"There is no information so far as the Vengalapuram project is concerned.

At about that place there is a river called Palar. A causeway on that river has been under construction for several years past. 1-30 p.m. After the construction was partly finished, a revised estimate had to be submitted to the Government. The traffic was obstructed owing to the construction of this bridge and the work could not be pushed through owing to want of sanction of the revised estimate by the Government. After a long delay the revised estimate was returned by the Superintending Engineer without sanction. They said that the Vengalapuram project was under construction and that the plans and estimates must be so designed as to provide for that project. I do not know whether this means that the Government would take the work in hand a few years hence. Can it be contended that, because the Vengalapuram project is under construction, we should not be in a position to complete the partly constructed bridge on the river Palar. I wish to point out to the House that that is one important aspect to be carefully considered. Unless the hon. the Law Member carefully considers all these questions and comes to a definite conclusion regarding the classification of productive and unproductive works and the hard and fast rules framed in regard thereto, no real improvement could be done in the irrigation projects of this province.

"I wish to draw the attention of the House to one other important matter and it is this. In budget page 59, under 'Miscellaneous expenditure', we find that for 'Irrigation Projects Division' a certain sum was provided in the accounts of 1921-22 and both in the budget estimate and revised estimate for 1922-23, we find some amount under this head. But in the budget estimate for 1923-24 no amount is allotted under this head. I wish to know whether this work has been completed and if not whether there is no

14th March 1923] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

necessity for the continuance of the work. If the work is still incomplete, I do not know why no amount is provided for the same."

At this stage (1-35 p.m.) the House adjourned for lunch.

The House re-assembled after lunch at 2-30 p.m., the hon. the Deputy President presiding.

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"Sir, I am indebted to my hon. friend Mr. Krishna Rao for having invited the attention of the House to three matters on which he has addressed himself. I shall first deal with the Vengalapuram project. So far as the Vengalapuram reservoir is concerned, the proposal is to form a reservoir by damming the Palar. The capital cost was originally estimated at 34 lakhs and the present estimate is about 50 lakhs. So far as the financial aspect of the scheme is concerned, even assuming the rate of Rs. 12-8-0 per acre as the standard, 3·6 per cent is the utmost that is likely to be got out of the project. As was pointed out by the hon. Member, in 1918, the Director of Agriculture was requested to negotiate with the ryots and his report showed that out of 31 villages, the ryots of only 17 were willing to pay the higher rate. It was therefore decided that the further consideration of the scheme should be deferred until the general question of the policy of water-rate assessment was settled finally. Now, that is not the only aspect of the matter. My hon. friend also referred to the obliteration of the difference between productive and protective schemes. Regarding that, I think my hon. friend will remember that after the publication of the Irrigation Commission Report, the Government of India considered the matter and in their despatch dated 1911, they laid down that certain percentages have to be secured up to 1st April 1919 and certain other percentages afterwards—6½ per cent in the present case and later on 6 per cent. The matter is consequently one which is not entirely within the cognizance of the Local Government; it is a matter entirely for the Government of India to decide in pursuance of their general policy whether this classification is right and should be kept on, or whether it has to be discontinued. I dare say that there are many cogent arguments not only in special cases but also in general cases for giving up that classification. I hope the hon. Members will realize that this Government cannot take any final step in the matter. Moreover, it has to be remembered that there is the question of interest on the sinking fund and the question of amortization of these debts. If proper provision is not made on these lines, the result will be the imposing of heavier burdens on the general taxpayer which I am sure the hon. Members will neither welcome nor demand.

"Then, Sir, so far as the Irrigation projects division is concerned, I may say it was abolished on account of the general retrenchment policy. But I may inform hon. Members of this House that an application is expected for completing the projects partially undertaken and to inaugurate the Tungabhadra and Kistna projects. When that application is brought forward, it will be favourably considered by the Government."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"Sir, my hon. friend Mr. Krishna Rao stated that in the case of special projects which were not productive, the Government should bear the surplus charge, which meant that the general tax-payer should be debited with that amount. I want to enter my emphatic protest against the soundness of such a policy. If it is stated that the whole irrigation revenues and the interest on irrigation projects,

[Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju]

[14th March 1923]

past and future, should be taken as one business concern, that stands on a different footing. But even limiting the general proposition to that extent, I cannot accept that in future all classifications between productive and protective works shall be done away with, that all protective works alone shall be undertaken and that the excess charges in the shape of interest, amortization, etc., shall be borne by the general tax-payer. I think it will be a very dangerous policy to pursue, and the future generation will not accept such a policy. For my part, I very much like to see that all irrigation projects, both past and future, are undertaken as one business concern, and the total outturn must be taken into consideration as long as it is a paying concern. However limited the incomes may be, it may be run for a greater number of years. Now we are paying about 40 lakhs as interest upon irrigation works, and, according to the Budget figures, the land revenue dependent upon irrigation is about 93 lakhs. There is thus a margin of 53 lakhs which entitles the Government to launch irrigation projects to the extent of nine crores in future, even calculating at the rate of 6 per cent. According to present rules, the policy of the Government is to call upon the ryots benefited by the proposed irrigation projects to pay a higher rate of water cess. I believe there are already some projects that were undertaken where a majority of the ryots undertook to pay the enhanced rate. A principle to this extent was embodied in the Irrigation Bill which was thrown out by this House the other day. I believe none of the Members of this House ever questioned the soundness of that portion of the Bill."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, in view of the few remarks that fell from my hon. friend Mr. Narasimha Raju, I am inclined to state my position clearly. My hon. friend has drawn the attention of this House to the desirability of asking for a joint account of the irrigation revenue derived from all the projects and of its being set against the interest over the capital outlay of all the schemes. I accept that view. He took objection to the course suggested by me regarding the modification of the distinction between productive and unproductive works. I believe my hon. friend fell into an error in not understanding my position properly. I do not suggest that all distinctions between productive works and protective works should be obliterated at once. I never suggested any such course. I stated that the present method of arriving at a project being unproductive was wrong. To determine a project as unproductive, we calculate interest at the high rate of 6 per cent irrespective of the fact that the ryots are called upon to pay more than other persons in other deltaic areas. This is a very unreasonable calculation. If the principle enunciated by my hon. friend Mr. Narasimha Raju is accepted, there is the danger of the course of action adopted by the Government making the rich richer and the poor poorer. The deltaic systems were introduced in some districts in favourable times and they are taking advantage of the system by paying a moderate rate of cess. Is it unreasonable for me to suggest that, in the case of these less fortunate districts in whose case it is necessary to expand the irrigation projects further, the Government should levy a reasonable rate of interest, no doubt more than the corresponding rate levied from those who have the advantage of the existing deltas? All I suggest is that there should be a limit to the levy. If the rate of levy is not modified, the result will be that those who have the irrigation system already will be greatly benefited, whereas new comers in the famine districts will always remain in the same predicament as before.

14th March 1923] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

"While realizing the difficulties pointed out by me, the hon. the Law Member only stated that the remedy lay in the hands of the Government of India and that nothing could be done by the Local Government. He pointed out that there were cogent reasons for the modification of the system, but he expressed his inability to go further into the matter. May I request him to make a representation to the Government of India so that they may move in the matter and bring about some modification in the directions suggested by me already? If he is at least prepared to give me the assurance that the views expressed in this House will be communicated to the Government of India and that he will insist on them to revise their rules and regulations and embark upon a more liberal policy, then I am willing to withdraw my motion."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Sir, I am relieved from the necessity of offering any lengthy remarks on account of the remarks that have fallen from my hon. friend Mr. Narasimha Raju. May I point out to my hon. friend Mr. Krishna Rao that the Government of India have not only made recommendations but have also laid down positive rules in regard to this matter? The Government order says:

'Where the schemes are productive, the rate should be  $6\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.' This afterwards became 6 per cent.

"The percentage rates referred to are those prescribed for the time being subject to alteration at the discretion of the Governor-General.

"These percentages, I have already referred to; and it is unnecessary for me to advert to it in any great detail. I may assure my  
2-45 p.m. hon. friend, Sir, that the proceedings of this Council will be transmitted to the Government of India for such action as they are prepared to take.

"There is one other matter which I think it is necessary to clear, and that is, with regard to this lumping up of irrigation projects. It can undoubtedly be taken as an admitted proposition that famine areas stand on a separate footing. It is only in regard to areas other than famine areas that the question of productive works comes into operation. It is in regard to those areas, where I think my friend Mr. Narasimha Raju wanted to confine his remarks, viz., in regard to other than famine areas, you will be putting a greater burden upon the general tax-payer if you adopt that policy—a policy which I thought Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao was at first in favour of, but having heard now what has fallen from him, I do not think I need say anything further on the matter."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"I withdraw my motion, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 71.

Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—"Mr. President, the motion that stands in my name reads as follows:—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 77,591 for new works by Rs. 100.*

Sir, I am at a loss to understand what is meant by new works and whether for new works the allotment of Rs. 77,591 will be sufficient. I wonder

[Mr. P. T. Rajan]

[14th March 1923]

whether there is any printer's mistake in the case of these figures also. Yesterday on demands under Excise it was pointed out by my hon. friend Mr. Pakkiriswami Pillai that there was a printer's mistake in the case of a certain figure and he protested against it."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" May I point out, Sir, as it might perhaps cut short discussion on this point, that the allotment of Rs. 9,47,745 mentioned in motion No. 225 is inclusive of the Rs. 77,591 mentioned in motion No. 224. The total grant under the head, inclusive of the non-voted charges, is Rs. 9,98,000 as I shall presently show."

Mr. P. T. RAJAN :—" I am glad to hear that statement, Sir, from the hon. the Law Member. I may also point out, Sir, to the lack of policy on the part of the Government as far as irrigation projects are concerned. When so much of money is being spent in every direction and when the revenue of the country depends on irrigation to a large extent, one wonders why so very little is spent on irrigation projects and works. Taking my district into consideration, Mr. President, there are ever so many repairs to be made in our irrigation works for the last twenty or twenty-five years, but nothing has so far been done. There are one or two projects to be carried through, but nothing has yet been done to carry them out. Mr. President, I must here bring to the notice of this House that some time back Government thought it necessary to have the Periyar project put through in order to give relief to the famine-ridden areas of Melur and Madura taluks; and by beginning the work and supplying water to the people, the inhabitants of those places, most of whom belong to the Kallar community and who were in the habit of earning their living by robbery, have given up their bad habits and settled down to agricultural life. Now, Sir, there are one or two other taluks in which the predominant population is made up of Kallars, and they are suffering from lack of water. It would be a very great relief to them if only water could be supplied to them. As a matter of fact, Government have taken the trouble of appointing an officer for doing reclamation works in these parts and are spending lakhs of rupees on it. But that, I may say, Sir, is only a temporary measure. If we really want to put an end to the bad ways to which the Kallar communities are addicted, we must find out radical remedies. The radical remedy that I would suggest is to supply them water so that they may settle down to peaceful avocations as those in the once famine-ridden taluks of Melur and Madura. If the hon. Member will give us an assurance that he will take some steps towards this, I have nothing more to add."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"Mr. President, I have already indicated that the sum of Rs. 77,000 and odd does not have the significance which at one time my friend Mr. Rajan was inclined to attach to it. So far as unproductive works are concerned, the demands preferred by the Public Works Department were completely allotted. But so far as the productive works are concerned, as was pointed out in the course of the debate, financial considerations have stood in the way of their getting as much allotment as they asked for.

"Now my hon. friend wanted to know whether I could give an assurance as to the possibility of reclaiming the Kallar population from their present somewhat uncivilized ways by giving them irrigation facilities. Now, my hon. friend will remember that there are schemes which are ready; there are

14th March 1923] [Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar]

schemes for which estimates have been called for, and there are schemes under investigation. These have to be taken up in the order of readiness and in the order of their being liable to be put into execution at once. Day after day, I am getting more and more schemes. I have in my hands schemes which will cover this amount and five or ten times that amount. If my hon. friend will forward any particular idea that he has to the department, the department will give earnest attention to the proposal. But I cannot possibly, in view of the schemes which are absolutely ready for execution and in respect of which the money at the disposal of the department is not adequate to cover all the demands that are likely to be put upon it, give any further, or more thorough or comprehensive, assurance than that."

MR. P. T. RAJAN :—" Mr. President, no doubt the hon. the Law Member said that there were more urgent schemes in other districts for which work had to be started. But, Sir, the talk about the irrigation project in Madura has been going on for the last ten or fifteen years. It is of as much importance as other projects. The other day, Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar, the late Law Member, gave an assurance that he would take some steps and that, as a matter of fact, he was taking some steps in that direction. If my hon. friend the Law Member will at least give an assurance that he will pay his attention to it, I have no desire to press my motion."

THE HON. MR. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, as to that particular matter, the Government have called for information which they are awaiting. \* And it is because Government are not in possession of the information which was referred to by my predecessor in office and on the basis of which alone any definite assurance on that particular scheme can be given that I had to give the answer that I gave."

MR. P. T. RAJAN :—" I am satisfied as regards that, Sir. As for the other portion of it, Sir, my hon. friend referred me to the officers concerned, but if we go and refer the matter to them, they say that they have not got sufficient money. The sum of Rs. 77,000 provided in the budget is not at all adequate. So my hon. friend the Law Member will try to get as much money as possible to carry out the work."

THE HON. MR. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" That is my ambition, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 72.

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, I beg to move—

*To reduce the total grant of Rs. 9,47,745 by Rs. 100.*

" I beg to invite the attention of the House to an unjust practice that prevails in regard to the levy of water rate for lands irrigated by what we call spring channels. I shall briefly explain the practice that obtains at present. These lands are irrigated by water taken from the rivers. There is no direct flow from the river; but the ryots concerned are to continually work on the bed of the river and outside it if they are to take water to their lands. These channels are often over a length of three or four miles and the practice is that for every acre of land that is irrigated under this channel, the owner sends a man to work at this channel, not for one or two days, but throughout the cultivation season which is for many months together. And if any particular man does not go and contribute his customary labour, then he is fined the amount that is necessary to appoint another in his

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [14th March 1923]

place to do the work which he should have done. Sometimes those people who are not able to contribute this labour personally, employ a person to attend to this work and the wages they pay for this is about Rs. 30 if the man attends to both the crops, or Rs. 16 if he attends only to a single crop. So that the irrigation charge which they themselves have to pay out of their pockets for irrigating a single crop is roughly about Rs. 16 per acre. Now supposing these lands were situated close to a first class never-failing source, the Government would not charge more than Rs. 6 or Rs. 8 for water which was available by direct flow without any trouble on the part of the ryots whatsoever. But in a case of this sort, the ryots are obliged to spend not less than Rs. 16 for a single crop and yet the Government claim a water charge and levy Rs. 4 or Rs. 6 for each acre of land. This is a great discouragement for the people to bring additional lands under irrigation. In areas like my district it is to the interest of the Government as well as of the people to allow more facilities for irrigation. When water is allowed to them from a first-class source, the Government will not charge more than Rs. 6 or Rs. 8; but to charge an additional amount of Rs. 4 or Rs. 6 over and above the Rs. 30 or Rs. 15, as the case may be, which the ryot is already spending, seems to me, Sir, rather iniquitous. I therefore suggest that, if the Government want to retain the right they undoubtedly have over the water, they may charge a nominal rate of 4 annas or 8 annas per acre in these cases. Nothing more than that is justifiable in these cases. I wanted to bring these things to the notice of the hon. the Law Member, who is in charge of this department and so it was that I tabled this motion."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"Sir, while I am indebted to the hon. Member for having drawn my attention to these points, it is impossible for me to say anything more than this, viz., that I will look into this matter carefully."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—"Does Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar withdraw his motion?"

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"With pleasure I withdraw, Sir, because the hon. the Law Member's conduct has been throughout refreshingly good in this Council."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 73.

Mr. V. C. VELLINGIRI GOUNDER :—"Mr. President, I beg to move—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 47,360 for hydro-electric surveys, Madras.*

My object in tabling this motion is to find out how far we have been progressing in these hydro-electric surveys. No doubt we have had enough of reports and pamphlets about them, and the report published recently covered some two volumes, if I remember aright. Under our present financial conditions, what is the immediate necessity for having any of these hydro-electric surveys when there is not the least opportunity of doing anything in that line? I do not see any necessity for a separate investigation or a separate allotment for it. So, I press my motion."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"Sir, I am glad I am given an opportunity of making a statement on this matter. The Hydro-Electric Survey Department will be closed down at the end of

14th March 1923]

[Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar]

March 1924, and the investigations on hand for the reconnaissance of 27 sites for which provision has been made will be completed before that date. The investigations in progress are expected to be completed by October 1923; but during the remaining part of the year, the Executive Engineer will be engaged in inspecting the sites to be reconnoitred, and this will entail travelling. With this information before him I do not know whether Mr. Vellingiri Goundar will persist in his motion. It has been determined to put a stop to the activities of this department on account of the general policy of retrenchment, however useful such activities might have been in normal and more prosperous financial years. But it is necessary to complete what has been begun as it will not do to leave things half done; it is from that point of view that this demand is proposed."

Mr. V. C. VELLINGIRI GOUNDAR :—"I hope some useful purpose will be served by the activities of this department. I do not press my motion."

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

## MOTION No. 74.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, I beg to move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 14,295 for Electrical Inspector by Rs. 500.*

Sir, I wish to say a few words on this motion. The bulk of the charges on account of the Electrical Inspector comes as the last demand we are proposing to cut. I want to know whether really any work of a useful nature has been done by this Electrical Inspector. No doubt, I am aware of the fact that probably through his exertion a large number of licences have been granted throughout the Presidency, and in my own neighbourhood in the Nilgiris, as many as three licences have been given. I want to know whether after the issue of these licences, the Electrical Inspector has cared to know whether any work has been done or whether there is any prospect of any work being done in the near future, because the country is at present very much interested in the progress of this department. We want power for all our industries; and we want also power for lighting municipalities, etc. Probably it is for lighting the municipalities that a large number of licences have been given. I will be very glad if the hon. the Law Member will be able to give us some information as to whether we can expect any real progress in the production of electric power at an early date."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"I have before me papers which demonstrate that the work that the Electrical Inspector has to carry out is of a varied character. It will be remembered that under the Indian Electricity Act he has to undertake inspection on a very vivid and comprehensive scale in addition to which, as he points out, he has to be touring regularly in the Vizagapatam district for the hospital electrical work there and in Tinnevely for another electrical work. He has to be on the look out always on account of the fact that he has to conform to the very exacting rules of the Indian Electricity Act. The granting of licences is not the only task before him; he has a very exacting kind of work. I have here details of his work; but I will not weary the House by telling them what exactly he has got to do. I think any one who reads through the Electricity Act and knows that there are many electrical ventures now, either being undertaken or about to be undertaken in this Presidency, will realize that any attempt to cut this small allotment would not be in the direction of any real progress."

[14th March 1923]

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, I will be the last man to cut any item which advances the country's progress. I know that this Inspector has some police duties also. I think it will be better to take away from him that power and give it to the proper person."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"I take it that the creation of electrical power involves the laying down of electrical plants; and the grant of licences for such purposes involves in turn considerable responsibility."

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

Demand VII—Irrigation Public Works Officers—for a sum not exceeding Rs. 52·67 lakhs was then put and carried.

#### DEMAND VIII—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Mr. President, I beg to move for the grant of 4·89 lakhs under Demand VIII—General Administration."

#### MOTION No. 75.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Mr. President, I beg to move—

*For the reduction of the allotment of Rs. 11,820 for pay of Indian rank and file by Rs. 100.*

This is an amount provided for His Excellency's Bodyguard. If you look at the retrenchment proposals of other provinces, there is a recommendation from the Bengal Retrenchment Committee that this allowance should be deleted from the budget, and it is expected that it will result in a saving of Rs. 1·20 lakhs. After all, conditions have now changed. There is no longer the same necessity for His Excellency to have a Bodyguard as he had in earlier days. Most of his tours are now done by motors and the necessity for a Bodyguard does not exist. The only occasions on which he is in need of these people is when he visits the Senate which is only once in a year. So I think it will meet with the approval of His Excellency and others if this provision can be deleted as no longer necessary."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Mr. President, I understand that the hon. Member has brought this motion because in Bengal the Retrenchment Committee have proposed the reduction of His Excellency's Bodyguard. My hon. friend has not told us whether that Committee's recommendations have been actually carried out."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I do not know that, Sir."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"With regard to the general question, I must inform the House that the question of retrenching by the abolition of the Bodyguard has already been under very careful consideration. His Excellency has given it his best attention and has come to the conclusion that on the whole the saving to be effected by the abolition would hardly make up for what would be lost by its disappearance. In Madras at any rate it has more than once been of great use in times of emergency, as for example in Guntur. Apart from that, I think hon. Members will agree that, except under the stress of the gravest emergency, it would be an ill-advised action to do away altogether with this appanage of His Excellency's position as the representative of His Majesty the King the more so when it is remembered that the ruling Princes and even some of the zamindars in

14th March 1923]

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

this Presidency have their bodyguards. To a stern philosopher, like my hon. friend, the bodyguard may seem an useless expense; but I honestly think that in the eyes of a very large number of people in this Presidency it is not only an attraction but it carries with it a lesson of discipline and loyalty. During the war, when we were driven to an extremity, the Bodyguard disappeared and if such an emergency were to recur certainly this would be the very first item to come under the axe. As matters stand at present, I would suggest to the House that they should accept this assurance that the matter has been carefully gone into and agree that though the Bodyguard may be a luxury—it is not a luxury of His Excellency, but of the Madras Government—it is not desirable to abandon this visible sign of His Excellency's position as the Governor of the Presidency."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I dare say the matter will come up again before the Retrenchment Committee and therefore I have no objection to withdraw."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

## MOTION No. 76.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"I beg to move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for travelling allowance of personal staff of His Excellency the Governor by Rs. 3,000.*

I find on page 63 of the Budget that the amount provided for in the Budget Estimate for 1922-23 is only Rs. 7,000 and that there is no disparity between the budget estimate and revised estimate of that year, whereas in the budget estimate which we are now considering I find a sum of Rs. 10,000 allotted for this purpose. This makes a difference of Rs. 3,000, and I am anxious to cut it. No explanation has been given to us for this increase, on the original budget, of Rs. 3,000 which, though small, attracts one's attention. In the absence of a satisfactory explanation I am tempted to press this motion."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Sir, the explanation of the increase in the provision lies in the increase of the railway fares by 25 per cent. This rise in the railway fares had not come into effect when our last year's Budget Estimate was prepared."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

## MOTION No. 77.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO:—"The motion that stands in my name runs as follows:—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 9,575 for the purchase of horses by Rs. 4,575.*

Sir, in the accounts for the year 1921-22 the expenditure under this head was only Rs. 1,470. For the year 1922-23 Rs. 9,575 were provided. For the coming year again a sum of Rs. 9,575 is allotted under the same heading. I want to know why this sum is asked for, and whether the horses that were purchased last year have become too old."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"The question of the provision for these horses was fully discussed last year when Sir Lionel Davidson gave the House a detailed explanation of the manner in which the figures were arrived at. I think it was Mr. Narasimhacharlu who raised the discussion. This year the provision for the purchase of horses is merely repeated. I am not

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

[14th March 1923]

quite sure what is in the mind of the hon. mover who objects to this provision. I do not know whether he objects to the calculation of the Military Secretary. The Military Secretary's calculation is that the life of the Bodyguard horse is ten years. You will see that with an establishment of 70 horses we require to replace seven horses regularly each year, and taking into consideration accident, sickness, and so on, that may occur the annual requirement is placed at ten. The price of horses has risen very considerably, and that being so, the sum that has been allotted is very reasonable."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

## MOTION No. 78.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"The motion that stands in my name runs as follows :—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 35,523 for the medical establishment of His Excellency the Governor by Re. 1.*

Mr. President, Sir, I want to elicit information under this head, i.e., the Medical establishment of His Excellency the Governor. The pay provided for the Surgeon is Rs. 1,700. I want to know whether this amount includes the allowance of Rs. 200. If it be so, that item ought to have been shown separately."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"That is a non-votable item."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"I want to know whether the allowance of Rs. 200 is also a non-votable item."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Sir, the amount of Rs. 1,700 even if it includes the allowance of Rs. 200 is a non-votable item. I would, therefore, ask you, Sir, to rule out that it is not a subject coming within the scope of the present discussion. If the hon. Member wants any information on this subject he can ask me, and I can give it."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"I want information as to whether this amount of Rs. 1,700 includes the allowance of Rs. 200."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"My point is that this item is put in italics, and therefore it is a non-votable item. Therefore following the ruling which the hon. the President gave this morning the hon. Member will be out of order if he discusses it. What the President said was that such items may be quoted or referred to but cannot be discussed."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—"I learn that the pay of the Surgeon is a non-votable item and that His Excellency has ruled that his allowance also is a non-votable item. I, therefore, think that the matter cannot be discussed."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

## MOTION No. 79.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"The motion that stands in my name runs as follows :—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,49,445 for staff and household of His Excellency the Governor by Rs. 1,000.*

Sir, all that I can say is that my idea is not to do away with all those gentlemen who form the staff of His Excellency the Governor. We see that so far as the present staff is concerned, there are nine people who are

14th March 1923] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

doing the work and my idea is that the Government may consider the desirability of dispensing with the services of some of them. In the case of the Bodyguard the example was cited that all our native Princes and several zamindars had this paraphernalia and therefore our Excellency the Governor also should have it. I do not want to say anything on this aspect of the question, but I would prefer that His Excellency the Governor himself shows an example to our Princes and other Ruling Chiefs by reducing as far as possible the number of his personal staff, more especially, as I am of opinion that in these democratic days a popular Governor, like His Excellency Lord Willingdon, would only be too glad to meet the wishes of the people, wherever possible, and would effect a considerable saving of expenditure so that the nation-building departments might utilize it for their purpose. Several Ruling Princes and Chiefs may have some other sorts of paraphernalia but I am sure His Excellency Lord Willingdon will not like to have them. I do not pursue this matter further.

“There is another point and that is the allowance to the honorary Indian Aide-de-Camp. It is certain that he is doing this work honorarily. We do not know why this sum of Rs. 3,500 comes under that head.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—“Sir, to take first the question last raised by the mover of the motion the Honorary Indian Aide-de-Camp is paid Rs. 7-8-0 for each day he is called to duty.

“I may explain that the arrangement, which was sanctioned by the Government of India and is in force in other presidencies as well as here, is that His Excellency has a certain list of Indian officers whom we may call up to do duty as Honorary Aide-de-Camp. One of these officers when called up receives the payment I have mentioned. The number of days for which these Indian Aid-de-Camps are called up for duty is a matter at the discretion of His Excellency. All that we do is to provide in the budget a sufficient sum to cover their allowances when they are called up. These appointments are in addition to His Excellency's other Honorary Aide-de-Camps who receive no kind of allowances.

“As regards the general question of a reduction in the staff of His Excellency the Governor the matter has been considered by His Excellency. The mover of the resolution seemed to compare the personal staff to the Bodyguard and to regard both as mere paraphernalia maintained for the purpose of display. This is by no means justified. While the Bodyguard may be maintained largely for the purposes of display the personal staff are employed for actual work. I can assure the House that they are not merely ornamental but that His Excellency—and perhaps I may say so even more Her Excellency Lady Willingdon keeps them very well employed.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—“I may bring to the notice of my hon. friend, Mr. Knapp, that the expenditure under the head of ‘Bodyguard’ was not debitable to the provincial revenues before. In the year 1921, when the Reforms Scheme was inaugurated, it was placed on the provincial estimate for the first time. I should think that if my hon. friend really considers that it is an ornament, as he puts it, it has really to be paid by the Government of India, because they have got a large army at their disposal and if they consider it necessary to place some of their men as Bodyguard to His Excellency the Governor, they may do so. My suggestion

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [14th March 1923]

is that these charges should not be met from the provincial funds, apart from the necessity and various other questions raised by some hon. friends stating that these Bodyguards are required to maintain the dignity of the zamindars and Native States. I am really suggesting to the hon. Member to consider the advisability of asking the Government of India to have a portion of their cavalry at their disposal stationed at Madras. The Bodyguard, instead of being stationed at Secunderabad or Bangalore, may well be left in Madras and paid for by the Government of India. I do not see why the provincial Government which did not pay before the year 1921 should be asked to pay now. The Government of India were anxious to get rid of their expenditure as much as possible and it looks as if they said 'here are Bodyguards and if the provinces want, let them have them and pay for them'. Some earnest attention is therefore necessary to get rid of this expenditure and if a Bodyguard is required by His Excellency the Governor, the Government of India should be asked to furnish it, the expenditure for the same being met by them."

The RAJA OF RAMNAD:—"I wish to ask the hon. the Home Member some information about this sum of Rs. 3,500. He told us, Sir, that the Indian Aide-de-Camp was paid a sum of Rs. 7-8-0 on each day that he was called to do duty. Even assuming that he is called to duty every day in the year it comes to only Rs. 2,737-8-0. I wish to know how the hon. Member arrived at Rs. 3,500."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"As regards the Bodyguard I may say that when it was proposed to transfer the cost of keeping it from the Military budget to our provincial budget we put up a fight but without success. The hon. Member has suggested that the Government of India might provide the Bodyguard from some of their Cavalry Regiments without extra expense. I am obliged to him for the suggestion but I foresee various difficulties. I am afraid a Regimental Colonel would be likely to object strongly if a portion of his Regiment had to be kept away in Madras permanently. As for getting a Cavalry Escort when it is needed it must be remembered that there is no Indian Cavalry nearer than at Secunderabad and it would be very expensive in trainage backwards and forwards, apart from the difficulty of foreseeing exactly when His Excellency would require their services. My hon. friend's other suggestion is that we should have Cavalry stationed in Madras. I wish we could. That might solve the difficulty. I will look into the suggestion but I am afraid I have very little hope that it will prove practicable."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR:—"Mr. President, I have one remark to make. I do not think that stationing cavalry here in Madras would enable us or help us to save much. Secondly, the maintenance of Bodyguards is not for purposes of mere show and *thamasha*. It is a mark or symbol rather of the prestige and honour which must be attached to the representative of His Imperial Majesty. The removal of the Bodyguards and the substitution of cavalry will show a kind of distrust of the loyalty of the people of this Province as if His Excellency was always in need of a military escort, and should have cavalry alone for his guards. I think the substitution is not justifiable."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I think a Daniel has come for judgment and I think my friend has gone much farther than the hon. Mr. Knapp himself. There are two sides; one useful and one showy. The

14th March 1923] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

useful portion also is sometimes showy. Therefore the more showy portion must certainly be omitted. Seeing that His Excellency himself is liberal in these matters and hoping that the Government itself will press upon His Excellency this point I am withdrawing this motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 80.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 86,000 for tour expenses by Rs. 6,000.*

Sir, year after year we have been complaining that His Excellency has been touring unnecessarily because the Government is now splitted up into a number of Ministers and Councillors. Therefore there is no necessity for His Excellency to go on tours. As has been pointed out last year I think that so much touring is unnecessary, and hence I am moving this motion for reduction. The provision for special trains for His Excellency's own use and haulage of his saloon carriages is made already for the current year. Notwithstanding that there is a typed copy of a supplementary demand placed in my hands—though it may not be moved just now—which indicates that the hon. Member will move a supplementary demand of Rs. 15,000. In this way instead of reducing they are adding to the tour expenses. By bringing this motion I wish to draw the attention of the Government to these facts."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—" The hon. Member mentioned that he proposed a similar motion last year. In fact year after year he has been moving it. I hope he is going to follow the example set by himself last year and will accept my assurance and withdraw the motion."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" I may not do this time."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—" The matter was discussed last year, and Sir Lionel Davidson announced His Excellency's intention to restrict his tours to absolute necessities. I may say that the more His Excellency tours in the various portions of the Presidency the better it will be for the administration in general. I am certain that the people of the districts are very glad to see His Excellency go down to their places. The charge has not actually increased, and it will be seen that the accounts for 1921-22 show a much higher figure: 86,000 is the revised estimate. But there is going to be a supplementary demand, which I may submit represents a capital item, viz., the actual building up of a carriage. It does not represent a recurring travelling allowance. For the next year we retain the same figure of Rs. 86,000. The only assurance that I can give is that His Excellency and the Military Secretary having got their sum fixed will take care and do their best not to exceed the allotment. We may be certain that they will do their very best."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" I am not satisfied with the explanation given by the Home Member and press the motion."

The motion was put and lost.

#### MOTION No. 81.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" Sir, I move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,51,600 for miscellaneous and unforeseen charges by 1,00,000.*

[Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu]

[14th March 1923]

"I am glad, Sir, I was the means of getting two mistakes corrected or the means of getting reduced two motions by my tabling motions here. One is 237 and the other is 239. I was under the impression when this 237 motion was tabled by me that the Government wanted Rs. 3,51,600, for meeting miscellaneous and unforeseen charges. You will find at page 214 of the Budget the above provision made. Now, I find from the erratum slip that was placed in my hands that this 3,51,600 is a mistake for 1,51,600. No doubt, Sir, I am glad that I have been the means of rectifying the mistakes for in the course of the year it may be assumed that it is three lakhs and odd and spent. I wish to know whether this is really a clerical error or whether subsequently the Government cut it down into 1,51,600. Even then the question remains the same: whether there is necessity for so much amount, when according to the revised estimate, only Rs. 14,000 has been put down and when the actual accounts of 1921-22, a similar amount of 14,040 has been put down. Now what is the meaning of these unforeseen and miscellaneous charges? According to the erratum slip a sum of Rs. 1,51,600 has been put down. How can these unforeseen charges be foreseen to such an exact figure of 1,51,600? I can understand a round figure being put down to meet the unforeseen charges. The unforeseen seems to have been very much foreseen and it would have been better if they had added eight annas four pies to show it as a very correct figure. Now so much money should not be put down especially when they come with a number of supplementary demands. What this amount is intended for, I do not know. Therefore I submit, Sir, that this 1,51,600 should be reduced by a lakh. Not only that. There is the next item about which I have not tabled any motion because I thought this one lakh would be reduced. There is a reserve provision at the disposal of the Government of 1,05,500 and the total is put down as 4,57,100. We have not got an erratum slip for that. Therefore, I say, Sir, that 51,500 is amply sufficient to meet the miscellaneous and unforeseen charges."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Mr. President, Sir, I must disclaim the marvellous foresight in foreseeing the unforeseeable which the hon. Member attributes to us and tell him that the item of Rs. 1,51,600 consists of 1,47,600 for miscellaneous charges which are foreseen and 4,000 for unforeseen. The total amount which is available for us to waste—as the hon. Member would put it—is Rs. 4,000. The item of Rs. 1,51,600 is made up first of 1,25,000 required to pay the Government servants in Malabar for losses of their property in the course of the rebellion. In the case of Government servants, it has always been the custom to make up for the loss which they may incur in doing their duty. This estimate includes the amount payable to village officers who suffered and lost their property. Then there is the item of 22,600 advances made to persons in criminal settlements, which we will have to write off. The explanation of this is, Sir, that when we transferred some of the Kavali settlers to Bitragunta and Alur we had to give them money to keep them while they reclaimed the land and brought it under cultivation. Some of the people who received advances died before they repaid the advance. In other cases they have left the settlements. But in spite of these losses the giving of the advances was entirely justified financially. The value of the land at Alur has risen by Rs. 400 or 500 an acre since they were reclaimed—from Rs. 100 an acre to Rs. 500 or 600. There are about 200 acres concerned, and it is clear that the advances written off are much more than covered by the rise in the

14th March 1923]

[Mr. A. R. Knapp.]

value of the land. In fact we must regard this Rs. 22,600 as spent by us in improving our land. The remaining item is Rs. 4,000 which represents the unforeseen charges."

Rao Rahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, in view of the information given by the hon. Mr. Knapp that the sum of Rs. 22,600, being the advances paid to the settlers in the Kavali settlement, is to be written off, I think that the matter requires further consideration before this House can accept that position. Further investigation as to the manner in which the Government have been aiding the various bodies at work in respect of these criminal settlements, is necessary. I wish to ascertain whether, in respect of this amount which is proposed to be written off, due enquiries were made from time to time and whether, when large sums were placed in the hands of private agencies for the purpose of doing the work like the one under discussion, that amount of care which one would expect in such cases had been taken. I have some intimate knowledge of the working of this criminal settlement now under discussion. I am associated with it as one of the non-official visitors, and I have had several opportunities of examining the question myself. I wish to know whether, when large sums of money were placed for the purpose of helping these settlers, there was a regular audit of accounts by responsible officers from time to time, whether they were scrutinised with that care and circumspection which the circumstances necessitated, and whether the Government made any investigation regarding the possibility of recovering these advances. I wish that we should have full information about these matters before we are called upon to vote for writing off this sum of Rs. 22,600 handed over to the private agency at Kavali. If, without a fuller investigation, we sanction this writing off, I think it would be a very bad precedent, and Government may take advantage of it in giving monies to private agencies for carrying on their work. For these reasons, I think that at least to the extent of Rs. 22,600 the House should withhold its sanction. If the hon. Mr. Knapp, after a further investigation, can satisfy the House for sanctioning this amount, he can come forward with a supplementary grant later on. But, at present, with the information placed before us, I don't think the House will be justified in sanctioning the amount. I, therefore, press upon the attention of this House not to accept now the proposition brought forward by Mr. Knapp to write off these advances."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Sir, my hon. friend is not accurate in describing the money in question as having been given to private agencies. The money in this case was not given to private agencies at all but was actually given to individual settlers."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"May I know, Sir, if the money was paid direct to the settlers or handed over to the manager of the settlement, who is a private agent, for being paid to the settlers? If the Government gave the money to the individual settlers direct, I have no quarrel. But if the Government handed it over to the manager of the settlement for being distributed among the settlers according to his discretion, according to his own principles and according to his own arrangement, I think it is objectionable."

[14th March 1923]

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"I do not know, Sir, if the hon. Member implies that the manager utilized the money for his own purposes. I may say that we are quite satisfied that the money reached the hands of these settlers. I want to make it clear that it is not a question of handing over a lump sum to private agencies of any kind. As regards the question whether sufficient inquiries have been made in this matter, all I can say is that it went to the Finance Committee; the Finance Committee first examined it and not being quite satisfied wanted that further inquiries should be made. Further inquiries were made; the matter passed through very careful scrutiny on the part of the Finance Department and finally the Finance Committee accepted it. I do not know if that will satisfy my hon. friend."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"Sir, as regards the first point that  $1\frac{1}{4}$  lakhs of rupees will be necessary for giving compensation to the Government servants in Malabar for the damages caused to them during the rebellion, I submit that only the other day this Council rejected a motion for a supplementary grant of nearly 9 lakhs of rupees intended for writing off the loans granted to certain persons. I submit, Sir, that unless the Council is in a better position to know the persons who sustained losses and the amount of losses sustained, we should not vote for the money, which can be utilized for certainly better purposes. I should also point out that in the explanatory note prepared by the Finance Secretary, the same amount of Rs. 3,51,600 is repeated. It is there explained that a sum of Rs. 3,25,000 is towards the payment of compensation for losses sustained by the officers in the Malabar rebellion. I asked the question whether this was really a clerical error or whether the amount was subsequently reduced, i.e., from Rs. 3,51,600 to Rs. 1,51,600. But that point has not been answered by the hon. the Home Member.

"Secondly I wish to know why this question of writing off the money granted to the criminal settlers was not specifically mentioned in detail either in the Budget estimate or in the explanatory notes. I submit, Sir, that we are entitled to have some detailed information on the matter and I am not at all satisfied whether these two are legitimate items of expenditure on the provincial finance. I therefore think that this one lakh of rupees should be omitted."

The motion was put and lost.

#### MOTION No. 82.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Sir, I beg to move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,51,600 for miscellaneous and unforeseen charges by Rs. 100.*

The figure which originally stood in the Budget against miscellaneous and unforeseen charges was Rs. 3,51,600 or roughly  $3\frac{1}{2}$  lakhs and it was for reducing that amount by Rs. 100 that I gave notice of this motion. I find on the agenda paper—and it is also confirmed by the hon. the Home Member in his speech on the previous motion—that the figure 3,51,600 has been reduced to 1,51,600 so that instead of the original provision of Rs. 3,51,600 we have now Rs. 1,51,600. This House may remember, Sir, that at the time of the introduction of the Budget, the hon. the Finance Member stated—and that was confirmed by the hon. Mr. Knapp—that a sum of Rs. 3,25,000 had been allotted for payment of compensation to those persons who suffered

14th March 1923]

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

losses during the Malabar rebellion. My hon. friend Mr. Narasimhachari referred to this in his concluding speech on the previous motion and referred also to the previous demand which the hon. Mr. Knapp submitted to this House but which he subsequently withdrew, that demand being for 10 lakhs. I may be permitted to inform my hon. friend Mr. Narasimhachari that this sum of Rs. 3,25,000 has nothing to do with the other sum of 10 lakhs which was discussed in this House. This is intended for payment of compensation for losses sustained and the other was intended for writing off the loans which had already been advanced."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"May I explain the matter, Sir? It is not quite correct to say that this hypothetical sum of Rs. 3,51,600 represented the amount of compensation payable to the officers. This hypothetical sum of Rs. 3,51,600 included two lakhs which was included in the 10 lakhs grant for which I unsuccessfully moved last month."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"What I was submitting to the House was quite correct, Sir. I submitted that the amount of Rs. 3,25,000 which was originally included in the provision was a separate item. Well, whatever it is, it is unnecessary to go into that question now. The hon. the Finance Member stated that he had intended this sum of Rs. 3,25,000 for payment of compensation to those who suffered losses in the rebellion. When this question came before the Finance Committee, I find that they made this note:

The Committee recommend the Budget provision, that is, Rs. 3,25,000; but would ask that before grant for distribution is made they should be advised of the principles on which it is proposed that the money should be distributed.

If I may be permitted to say so, I think that the observation made by the Finance Committee is a very reasonable one and before this money of Rs. 3,25,000 is actually distributed, I hope that this House will be informed of the principles on which it is intended that the money should be distributed. But after I have given notice of this motion, that is, to-day, I learn from the speech of the hon. Mr. Knapp on the previous motion that it is not now intended to allot Rs. 3,25,000 for payment of compensation to these sufferers.

"My hon. friend Mr. Knapp stated that the amount that is proposed to be debited now is not Rs. 3.25 lakhs but only 1.25 lakhs.

4 p.m.

In other words, out of the original provision that was made in the budget, the Government have reduced the amount by 2 lakhs, and this 1.25 lakhs is intended to be distributed amongst the Government servants who have suffered loss during the rebellion. Of course I have no objection to this. I only wish to point out how the Government are constantly changing their mind. I should like to know whether they intend to distribute any portion of this amount to the ordinary sufferers. As remarked by the Finance Committee, this House should be informed of the principles on which the distribution is to be made. So long as Government do not recognize their legal liability to make compensation, a difference should be made between the persons to whom this compensation is paid. That is to say, those rich persons, whether individuals or companies, whoever they may be, persons who are really able to make good their loss in course of time, those persons should not be given compensation, but those who are unable to make up their loss may be given."

[14th March 1923]

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Am I to understand that my hon. friend is trying to apply his criterion of rich and poor to Government servants, who alone are contemplated under this provision? Are we to distinguish between rich Government servants and poor Government servants?"

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"My hon. friend has misunderstood me. If he had attended to my remarks with some care he would certainly not have misunderstood me. I have no objection whatever to the payment of compensation to Government servants who were doing their work at the time. I make no distinction between the rich and poor among Government servants. My point is that the provision that was originally made was subsequently reduced to 1.25 lakhs and Government have changed their mind again."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"It is very clear that the hon. Member is not talking on this grant. He has not said one word about this Rs. 1,51,600. He gives advice to the Government in case they sanction something which is not here."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"It was not 1.51 lakhs. It was stated in the budget statement placed before us that the amount was not 1.51 lakhs but 3.51 lakhs. Referring to this again, the Finance Secretary in his statement has said in one portion which is specifically devoted to this subject that it was intended to be 3.25 lakhs. This was supplemented by the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter in his speech when introducing the budget. This was again supplemented by the hon. Mr. Knapp. It was with reference to these figures that I gave notice of this reduction, not out of 1.51 lakhs as it appears now on the agenda paper, but out of 3.51 lakhs as appeared in all the previous Government records."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member will forgive me if I point out that at present the House is only dealing with 1.51 lakhs."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I am not responsible for it."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I know that the hon. Member is not a Member of the Government and so he is not responsible for it; but he is certainly responsible for his motion. Whatever his misapprehension might have been at one time, at present the motion before the House is to reduce the allotment of 1.51 lakhs by Rs. 100. So far as I can gather he has not said one word objecting to it."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"May I mention, Sir, in defence of my hon. friend that he said he had no objection to the Rs. 1,51,600?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I understand that he does not want to press this motion to a division."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I do not Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 83.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"Sir, I beg to move—

*To reduce the allotment of 4.89 lakhs for general administration by Rs. 100.*

Sir, in this case also, the original amount was Rs. 6.89 lakhs, an erratum slip was recently issued and it is now put down as 4.89 lakhs. The point

14th March 1923] [Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu]

I wish to raise is this. It has been strongly and persistently said that this Council will be dissolved about August or September or even in July. We are not sure when it will be. Sometime ago it was said that the life of this Council would be prolonged. I for one am neither for prolonging it nor for dissolving it. According to the Government of India Act the life of the Council is ordinarily three years from the date of the first meeting of the Council. No doubt, the section provides for an early dissolution of the Council by the Governor of the Province, but there must be good reason for the Governor of the Province to dissolve the Council before its life is out."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"May I rise to a point of order? I understand my hon. friend is discussing Legislative bodies which form part of the next demand."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"My answer to that is that I tabled my motion under this head for the reason that it is His Excellency the Governor that exercises the privilege of dissolving the Council earlier. As His Excellency the Governor comes under this grant I have tabled the motion here. My point is that His Excellency the Governor should not exercise the discretion of dissolving the Council before its usual term. I wanted to convey my impression about such a course to His Excellency so that he might take note of it at the time. It is stated that the usual election time of November would be inconvenient because it is a rainy month and therefore inconvenient. But I would submit that the proposed remedy would be worse than the existing state of things. If an election is held in August or September, that would be the cultivation season and the ryots would be very busy."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Order, order. I understand the hon. Member thinks that the Governor would be well advised not to dissolve the Council in July or August as rumoured, but on the due date, i.e., in November. He seeks to express that view by moving a reduction of Rs. 100 under this grant. I do not think he is in order, because the Governor's discretion is hardly a matter which can be discussed by the House. He is outside the whole machinery."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"We are inside the machinery, Sir. There is the Council and whatever action His Excellency the Governor may take on it is a matter pertaining to us. Can we not express our opinion so that His Excellency may take note of what we think upon this subject before he exercises his discretion?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"There is absolutely no objection; all that I say is that the hon. Member should not do it in this particular way. I quite see that the hon. Member wants to give a piece of advice to His Excellency on this point." (Laughter).

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I do not arrogate to myself that task as to how he is to conduct the administration. Certainly not. It is in the interest of the Council and as a member of the Council and in my own interest too that I said that. (Laughter). I do not wish to give a piece of advice to His Excellency on a point of administration."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I appreciate the hon. Member's modesty. I daresay the hon. Member is entitled to give his advice. He is entitled to ask for an interview and express his opinions personally to His Excellency. All that I say is that he cannot discuss that question here on a vote for the

[The President]

[14th March 1923]

reduction of an allotment. His Excellency's powers as a controlling officer are quite apart from the Government. We are dealing with the budget, and I do not think I can allow any discussion as to what the proper time for the dissolution of the Council is and other things. The whole thing will be out of order. Any how the hon. Member has made his speech. I am sorry I did not rise earlier. So we will go to the next thing."

Demand No. VIII was put to the House and carried; and the grant was made.

#### DEMAND IX—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—LEGISLATIVE BODIES.

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"Sir, I rise to move Demand IX—General Administration—for a grant not exceeding 4·63 lakhs."

##### MOTION No. 84.

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"Sir, I move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,000 for the travelling allowance of non-official Members and voting delegates by Rs. 70,000.*

My reason for bringing forward this motion is that the expenditure under 'General Administration—Provincial Legislative Council,'  
4-15 p.m. has gone up very much in this year's budget. The budget estimate of last year provided for only 2·77 lakhs. It has gone to 4·41 lakhs this year. Motions were tabled last year for the reduction of the travelling allowances but the Council was not willing for the reduction. But now finding that the expenditure is almost doubling, that the Government and the public officers are finding fault with us that we do not agree for a reduction in our allowances while we are very enthusiastic about cutting down theirs, it is incumbent on this Council to make up its mind to forego a portion of the allowances. With these words, I move for the reduction."

##### MOTION No. 85.

Mr. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU :—"Sir, I move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,000 for the travelling allowance of non-official Members and voting delegates by Rs. 60,000.*

Sir, in my opinion the travelling allowance of the non-official Members of this Council may be reduced to one first-class for himself and a third-class for a servant. The hon. Ministers have shown their self-sacrifice by agreeing for the reduction of their salaries and it is but reasonable that the Council should also show their sense of self-sacrifice by reducing their travelling allowances and thus add their mite to the retrenchment of expenditure."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I also support the motion for reduction of the provision made for the travelling allowance. This question came up during the previous session of the Council and several of us supported it but unfortunately we were not able to carry out our intentions. And it is not too late to mend the previous decisions of this House. So long as we have been urging upon the attention of the Government the necessity for reducing the allowances in the case of their officers, it is but necessary that Members of this Council should set the example in the direction themselves. Otherwise they will lay themselves subject to the remark that, while they are advocating reduction in the case of others, they are not prepared to apply it to themselves. I hope the Members of the House will realize that

14th March 1923] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

aspect of the question and will willingly support the reduction moved. Otherwise we will not be justified in our demands for reduction of allowances of other officers."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Does the hon. Member support the motion for reduction by Rs. 70,000 or the motion for the reduction of Rs. 60,000 or does he move his own motion for reduction by Rs. 40,000?"

\* Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"I began by saying, Sir 'I support the motion of my hon. friend Mr. Appalanarasayya Nayudu for reduction by Rs. 60,000.' If the reduction by Rs. 60,000 is not accepted, then, Sir, the motion for Rs. 40,000 may be voted upon."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Yes. But the motion for reduction by Rs. 40,000 cannot be voted upon unless it is moved."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, there are four or five other Members who have given notice of motions for reduction by Rs. 40,000. I leave it to them to move the motion. I now support the proposal for the reduction by Rs. 60,000."

#### MOTION No. 86.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"In addition to the ground stated by the previous speakers, I have got another ground for the reduction, namely, that there will be no Council after July. As there will be no meeting there is no necessity for making any provision in the current year for so much amount. As there is to be no meeting for four months, I calculated that the reduction could be to the extent of Rs. 40,000." I therefore move—

*to reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,000 for the travelling allowance of non-official members and voting delegates by Rs. 40,000."*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—" 'Better late than never' were the words that I used when I thanked the hon. Ministers of this House when they agreed for the reduction of their salary. Of course there is no question of being better late than never when we were thanking you, Sir, for the reduction that you were pleased to make. But I must say, Sir, better late than never for this Council. I was responsible for a motion suggesting a reduction in the allowances, but year after year the Council was pleased to reject it. If the new elections are not going to be of much use to the people at least it is of a little use to remind the members of this House that they have a master outside in the electorate. I propose a reduction of Rs. 40,000 not on the grounds advanced by my hon. friend, Mr. Narasimhacharlu. He does not want to reduce a pie out of the allowances but calculated the reduction from the possibility of there being no meetings for some four months. I do specifically say that this amount of Rs. 40,000 can be reduced not on any such possible contingency for even if there is an early election there will be an early meeting in October or so and the expenses will be practically the same. It is not merely imaginary to say: 'You cut off 60 or 70 thousands.' The principle that I am always trying to apply is that already proposed by Mr. Appalanarasayya Nayudu that one first class and one third class will do. The sum of Rs. 40,000 will be necessary for daily allowances of the Members, for the travelling allowances, Rs. 50,000 will be enough for one first-class fare and Rs. 10,000 will do for a third-class fare. So that a lakh of rupees will suffice on the whole. The calculation is fairly correct and leaves a saving of Rs. 40,000 from the

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [14th March 1923]

provision made. This is not the first time, Sir, as I have already said, I move a proposition of this kind. It is high time that we should follow the example set by the Ministers. If we make this reduction, I am sure the Ministers will try to be even more liberal than what they have been already. Precedents are not wanting to show that a first class and a third class will be enough. The committee that sat on the State Aid to Industries Act presided over by Mr. Thomas agreed for a first and a third class. We shall follow the precedent and show to the public that we are also prepared for sacrifice. After all it is not a very great sacrifice.

"Again, Sir, I wish to point out that the calculation on which I have proceeded in moving for this reduction is to provide for a single first and a single third class and as it is a fairly correct calculation, I suppose there will be no necessity felt for moving for a supplementary grant at the end of the year. I therefore move—"

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—"Sir, I rise to support the motion for the reduction of Rs. 40,000 on the ground of retrenchment and on the ground that the reduction would lead to a solution of the question of the congestion of business in this Council. Sir, I take it that the latter subject is a method of retrenchment also. Sir, you have been good enough to appoint a committee to suggest methods by which the congestion of non-official business of this House could be relieved. The committee has sent its report. Unfortunately, I had to differ from the majority. The committee has suggested that the Council should sit for seven days at the most allowing three days for official, two for non-official business and if necessary for two days more. I submit, Sir, I had also the good fortune to sit in the pre-Reform Council for a year and a half and I would like, Sir, that the procedure adopted in that Council should be adopted here also. I do not see any reason why the old Council should find it possible to sit from day to day till the business before it was over and why the present Council should sit only for five days and push through as much work as is possible, then carry it over to the next sitting, reprint the agenda for circulation and incur printing charges therefor. It is not a question of my reducing the double first class which my friends from the mufassal are drawing or the daily allowance of Rs. 10 but what I say is this; that if you are able to sit till the agenda is over it is possible for us as representing the electorate here to finish matters in the interests of the public. There is no use for the moment saying that the whole non-official business is being blocked by official business. We have to take into consideration the official business also for that is the most important thing. There is no use of filling up the agenda with resolutions on matters of general public interest and to sit only for five days and then to clear out. For two years we have seen how motions notice of which was given about July were not reached till March of next year. Look at the wastage the whole business involves in reprint of the agenda for distribution month after month. If we are going to sit for a month and finish the agenda, it may not be necessary to sit during the next month. The travelling allowances may thus be reduced and the daily batta will also go down. It is on this ground of retrenchment and as a method of relieving the congestion of non-official business that I move for the reduction."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir I must express my gratification that so many Members have tabled a motion more or less with the same purpose. Like my hon. friend, Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar,

14th March 1923] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

I took some trouble to calculate what the probable savings are likely to be, if we accepted a single first-class fare and a third-class fare for a servant. The savings work out to Rs. 40,000, and I have put down that figure in this motion for reduction. If this proposition is accepted to-day in this House, Sir, I am sure you have made that acceptance possible by your worthy example, followed by that of the Ministers. (Cries of 'Hear, hear'.) Here I am tempted to state, Sir, that in my own district, poor as the people are, they have set us the example of taking less allowances than we are eligible for. We have a taluk board president there who does more touring than even the busiest Government official, and he does not claim any allowances though he is entitled to do so. I know of a board whose members have agreed unanimously to take only one second-class fare, and of a taluk board president who has restricted himself to Rs. 200 a year for all his touring. On the one side we have such eminent examples, as we see in this House and on the other side we have comparatively poor people who in the interests of the country are foregoing their claims for greater allowances. I hope we shall not be wanting in our readiness to follow them. The present system is not even equitable. People coming from long distances and claiming double first class draw more than what I consider to be reasonable. A person may be coming from a short distance, but he may be spending quite as much time to reach Madras as the one who comes from a distant place. All these inequalities would disappear if this motion is accepted. If any constituency wants a member who cannot afford to attend this Council under the present arrangement, it is up to the constituency to make it possible for him to represent them if they care to have his services, and I think this Council need not concern itself with such exceptional cases."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" Sir, I have no objection to accept the earlier motion which has been just moved for a reduction of Rs. 40,000. But at the same time I have given 4-30 p.m. notice of a motion to reduce the travelling allowances by Rs. 25,000. I would, however, formally move my motion, namely,—

MOTION No. 87.

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,000 for travelling allowance of non-official members and voting delegates by Rs. 25,000.*

So that, in case hon. Members may find that it is more acceptable to them, they may vote for it. My reason for asking for the reduction by Rs. 25,000 is this. First-class officers and Members of the Legislative Council were paid in the old days two first-class fares. But since then there has been an increase in the railway rates, with the result that from the extra first-class fare the Members of this Council and first-class officers are making a profit, and that is a profit which is not due to any additional expenditure they are incurring but a sort of windfall, if I may say so. The first-class fare now would cost the Government more on account of the increase in the railway rates. I do not think it is justifiable that we ought to claim this additional advantage. So, about  $1\frac{3}{4}$  first-class fares would cover what the first-class officers and Members of the Legislative Council were getting in the old days. I may also add that quite recently we heard that in Bombay it has been decided or recommended, I am not quite sure which, that  $1\frac{3}{4}$  first-class fares would be quite sufficient for first-class officers. That is a standard which has been fixed independently by another Government, and so we thought in the Finance Committee, at any rate some of the non-official

[Mr. T. A. Ramañinga Chettiyar] [14th March 1923]

members of that committee thought that that standard might be made applicable to this province also. If that is to be made applicable here, a reduction of Rs. 25,000 out of the allotment of Rs. 1,40,000 under this item, would be possible. It is on that calculation that I mentioned the figure for reduction as Rs. 25,000. Personally I have no objection to the reduction of Rs. 40,000, but all the same, I move this reduction of Rs. 25,000 on this basis, namely, that in another province, Bombay, they have adopted the rate of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  first-class fares."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"I beg to support the motion of my hon. friend, M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu, Sir, and do not move my own motion on the paper."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"Sir, from the very nature of things, I am not going to make any lengthy reply in regard to these motions. It may be of interest to the Members of this House to know that the actual expenditure under this item comes to nearly Rs. 1,20,000. The matter was thoroughly thrashed out on the last occasion when the question came up last year as to the travelling allowances of the non-official members, and all the arguments for and against were advanced by the non-official members on the one hand and Mr. Moir and others on this side. It is a matter entirely for the House to decide, that is, the question of travelling allowances of Members, and I do not think I need intervene for a moment between the debate and the vote." (Hear, hear.)

The motion of Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu for a reduction of Rs. 70,000 was then put to the House and lost.

The motion of Mr. Appalanarasayya Nayudu for a reduction of Rs. 60,000 was next put to the House and lost.

The motion of Mr. Narasimhacharlu for a reduction of Rs. 40,000 was next put to the House and carried.

Rao Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—"Sir, I only wish to know whether orders for the revision of the electoral rolls have been issued . . ."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member had better formally make the motion, and then ask for the information."

## MOTION No. 88.

Rao Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—"I beg to move the following motion which stands in my name :

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 13,000 for additional establishment in the Secretariat for new elections by Re. 1.*

In doing so, I should like to know whether orders for the revision of electoral rolls have been issued by Government, and if not, when they will be issued."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"Sir, in view of more than one motion tabled on this subject and standing on the agenda, I wish to take this opportunity of explaining the position. The first preliminaries have been gone through with regard to the preparation and the making of arrangements for the revision of the electoral rolls. The Collectors have been asked to bring forward proposals in regard to that matter. When those proposals come up before the Government, proposals for additional establishments and requests for information are also likely to come up. Then, there is a conference now sitting at Delhi to consider the question of the system of

14th March 1923]

[Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar]

electoral rolls and the preparation of them. When that conference has arrived at some conclusion, the question as to what steps this Government should take to come into line with such conclusions if necessary will have to be considered by Government. It is a matter in deciding which great weight will be placed on what is to take place at Delhi. All these things and the regulations for the conduct of elections remain to be put through. It is with a view to provide for all these things that the Budget allotment that is now sought to be reduced by Re. 1 has been put in, namely, an amount of Rs. 13,000. That amount of Rs. 13,000, I may mention to the House, is only the maximum. It is made up of the salary of an assistant secretary, a superintendent, an upper division clerk, two lower division clerks and three peons. At present we are only working with one superintendent, an upper division clerk and a typist. That is all. It may be necessary for the other establishment to be called into aid if the work increases. It is not possible at this stage to foretell exactly the amount or the quantity of work which will fall to the share of the department, and very much will depend upon the reports we receive from the various local officers on that matter. We are working with the minimum staff, only a superintendent, an upper division clerk and a typist; but this Rs. 13,000 is the maximum provision designed to be utilized if and when occasion arises. On that basis and that basis alone is the demand made."

Rao Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—"I thank the hon. Member for the information he has given, and I do not press my motion, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 89.

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"Sir, I beg to move the following motion which stands in my name :—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,73,000 for charges on account of new elections by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Sir, my reasons for suggesting this reduction are these. At page 66 of the Budget, we find that this provision is entirely new. We also find from the figures in the Budget that the expenditure on the Legislative Council is proposed to be increased from about 2½ lakhs in the current year to about 4½ lakhs in the next year. In the year 1920-21, I think that in the old Budget there was entered an expenditure of only Rs. 21,700 under this item of election expenses. I do not see the necessity of expending so much as Rs. 1,73,000 next year as against Rs. 21,700 in the year 1920-21. I therefore urge that this reduction may be accepted by the House."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"Mr. President, I am afraid there is some misapprehension on this matter. During the last general election the Secretariat establishment came to nearly Rs. 2,00,000. Apparently the misapprehension has crept in from the circumstance that it was put in under the head 'Reforms Secretariat'. So, the expenditure was Rs. 2,00,000 and odd on the last occasion. My hon. friend is not, therefore, correct in saying that this is a new item of the expenditure which has crept in on account of these elections. Now my hon. friend would realize that the work of preparation of the new electoral rolls has to be gone through, and elections have to take place betimes. As a matter of fact, as early as July 1921 all the Collectors and Commissioners were requested to furnish estimates of cost. They estimated it at Rs. 1,39,000, and Rs. 1,000 more has been added to that estimate. We all hope that the actual expenses will be less.

[Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar] [14th March 1923]

Hon. Members will see that the electorate is presumably much more educated now than it was on the last occasion, and the work on account of elections may conceivably increase. I trust that, on the whole, especially after the information furnished by me, he will see that the demand is not very extravagant."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

## MOTION No. 90.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" Sir, I formally move the motion standing against my name, which runs as follows :—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,73,000 for charges on account of new elections by Rs. 1,000.*

My object in moving this reduction is to get some information about the new elections. I do not think in asking for this information, I am encroaching upon the privileges or prerogatives of His Excellency the Governor. So far as the dissolution is concerned, we need not trouble ourselves about it, but I think it is desirable to know at this stage as to when the new elections are likely to take place. Is it this year or next year? If they are to be held this year, the Budget would be all right so far as this item is concerned. That is how, I think, this matter comes as a question in this Budget. The matter as to the portion of the year in which the election is to take place also comes under this Budget, because if it takes place in the rainy season it will cost more and if it takes place in the dry season it will cost less. This information as to the probable date of the election is very useful to me in deciding as to whether I should press my motion or not. We are entitled to know when the new elections are likely to take place. The hon. the Law Member who is in charge of elections would certainly be giving advice to His Excellency as to when the elections are to take place, and I suppose it is within his province to do so.

"There is also another point. We want to know when this election will take place, and whether it will be along with the elections to the Assembly, and that again becomes a question of the Budget. We do not know who is to be responsible for the elections to the Assembly, and if these elections take place at the same time, the cost will be less. We are entitled to know the date of the new elections on these grounds which have all a bearing on the question of cost which is connected with this Budget, apart from the question of facilitating the candidature of persons for the local Councils, the Legislative Assembly or the Council of State. I hope for these reasons, that the hon. the Law Member will take us a little into his confidence, as whatever he may say need not necessarily bind him, and inform us when the new elections will take place."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I have no desire to withhold from any hon. Member of the House any information that is available to me. But as has already been pointed out by you, Sir, section 72-B of the Government of India Act vests the dissolution of this House in the Governor. No doubt, by a process which was, if I may say so, characteristically ingenious, my hon. friend has striven to bring this matter under another category in order to press for his information. I may at once tell him that in all probability His Excellency the Governor will make a definite announcement on these matters at no very distant date. I find that there is a smile going round the House, and it is not

4-45 p.m.

14th March 1923]

[Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar]

a date which will be so distant as to justify any smiles or laughter. In the course of a very few days, as a matter of fact, it is expected that an announcement will be made regarding the question of the dissolution of the Council and of the arrangements for the new election and so forth, and I am sure my hon. friend will be perfectly satisfied when he sees that the announcement is made.

“Reference has been made, Sir, to the Assembly election and the election for this Council, but so far as we are concerned, we have to concern ourselves only with the preparation of the electoral roll for the ensuing election, as the fixation of the date of the Assembly election is not with the Governor but elsewhere. Therefore, it is impossible for me with all the will in the world to give a definite information; nor is it possible for His Excellency the Governor to give any definite information. I am sure the hon. Member will realize that, in so far as that point is concerned, questions will have to be asked elsewhere and information elicited.”

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“I am afraid, Sir, that the hon. the Law Member has misunderstood me. First of all, I may say that our smile or laughter had reference to the really clever way in which the hon. Member met my arguments.

“What I was saying was that if the Government was not responsible for the Assembly elections this Government might wait a little till an announcement of the date of their elections was made by the Government of India, after which the date for the elections of this Council might be declared. I think the Government will not take it to be so unreasonable because a little correspondence will settle this matter easily, and I am sure some amicable settlement might be come to, so that the Assembly and the Council elections might be held together, and this will save much trouble and expense to the electors, to the candidates and to the hon. the Finance Member. I withdraw my motion, Sir.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 91.

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD SADULLA BADSHA SAHIB :—“Sir, I beg to move the motion that stands in my name, viz.—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for Persian and Hindustani Translator by Rs. 100.*

The post of Hindustani Translator to Government has hitherto been held usually by Europeans of the Army Department. Subsequently the post was held by Khan Bahadur Bazlullah Sahib Bahadur, Commissioner, Madras Corporation. Owing to certain technical legal difficulty he was asked to resign and that vacancy, I understand, has not yet been filled. Of course, the Government will be able to enlighten me on the subject and say whether my statement is correct. My object is that the post of Hindustani Translator should be held by a qualified Muhammadan. The present Commissioner of the Madras Corporation, Khan Bahadur Muhammad Bazlullah Sahib Bahadur, who is a great scholar in Hindustani and Persian, may be appointed if the Government is so willing and if the Commissioner is willing to accept it. Otherwise, it may be given to any other qualified Muhammadan. The object of this motion is only to invite discussion and elicit information whether there was a dearth of Muhammadans qualified to hold the post of Hindustani Translator and why the vacancy is kept unfilled. Is it on the ground of

[Muhammad Sadulla Badsha Sahib] [14th March 1923]

economy? It is not clear why provision is made separately under two heads, viz., 'Hindustani Translator' and 'Examiner in Hindustani', unlike the case of other translators to Government."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I take it that the object of this motion is to elicit information as to the way in which a pending appointment is going to be filled up. The appointment has not yet been filled up. But I can tell this House this : that there is no idea at present of appointing a European for this place, but that every effort will be made to appoint a suitably qualified Muhammadan gentleman for this place. I cannot give any further information as to the actual incumbent or the likely candidate. I trust that with this assurance my hon. friend will not press his motion."

Khan Bahadur Muhammad Sadulla Badsha Sahib did not press his motion, and it was by leave withdrawn.

#### DEMAND No. 92.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" Mr. President, Sir, on page 69 of the Budget under the heading of 'Travelling Allowance' for the year 1922-23 Rs. 2,500 was provided, but only Rs. 500 was actually spent. In these circumstances, I see no reason for allotting Rs. 2,000 for 1923-24. So I formally move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 1,000."*

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" I think this is one of the motions which I shall be able to accept, because as a matter of fact only Rs. 473-12-0 was spent last year. This expenditure arose on account of the possibilities of the Translator having to attend courts and to pay for his attendance. I have great pleasure in accepting this motion."

The motion was put and carried.

Demand IX—General Administration for Rs. 4.63 lakhs minus the reductions made was put to the House and carried; and the grant was made.

The House then adjourned at 4-55 p.m. to meet again at 11 a.m. on Thursday, the 15th March 1923.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,  
*Secretary to the Legislative Council.*

#### APPENDIX

[Vide page 2305 supra.]

#### NOTIFICATION.

*Fort St. George, February 5, 1923 [G.O. No. 410, Law (General)].*

No. 125.—The following Press Communiqué will be issued :—

At its meeting held on the 14th September 1922, the Legislative Council passed the following resolution :—

"This Council recommends to the Government to increase the number of Government audit certificate-holders by granting certificates as hitherto done to men of experience in auditing accounts of firms."

2. With the introduction of the Indian Companies Act, 1913, the necessity for creating a class of auditors qualified to audit the accounts of companies arose,